arXiv:1512.06040v2 [math.AC] 21 Sep 2016

THE COHEN–MACAULAYNESS OF THE BOUNDED COMPLEX OF AN AFFINE ORIENTED MATROID

RYOTA OKAZAKI AND KOHJI YANAGAWA

Abstract. An affine oriented matroid $\mathcal{M}$ is a combinatorial abstraction of an affine hyperplane arrangement. From $\mathcal{M}$, Novik, Postnikov and Sturmfels [10] constructed a squarefree monomial ideal $O_{\mathcal{M}}$ in a polynomial ring $\widetilde{S} = \Bbbk[x_1, \ldots, x_n, y_1, \ldots, y_n]$, and got beautiful results. Developing their theory, we will show the following.

(1) If $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$ is Cohen–Macaulay, then the bounded complex $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$ (a regular CW complex associated with $\mathcal{M}$) is Cohen–Macaulay as a topological space. Moreover, it is a contractible homology manifold with boundary. This is closely related to Dong's theorem ([4]), which used to be "Zaslavsky's conjecture".

(2) We give a characterization of $\mathcal{M}$ such that $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$ is Cohen–Macaulay, which states that the converse of [10, Corollary 2.6] is essentially true.

1. Introduction

A linear hyperplane arrangement in $\mathbb{R}^d$ gives an *oriented matroid* and an ordinary (i.e., non-oriented) matroid. Roughly speaking, ordinary matroids just care whether the values under consideration are zero or not, but oriented matroids care the signs $\pm$ of non-zero values. For a general theory of oriented matroids, see [2]. If an oriented matroid $(E, \mathcal{L})$ is given and if we chose a distinguished element $g \in E$, then we have an *affine* oriented matroid $\mathcal{M} = (E, \mathcal{L}, g)$. Philosophically, $\mathcal{M}$ is "embedded" in $(E, \mathcal{L})$. More precisely, $(E, \mathcal{L})$ can be represented as a combinatorial structure on a d-sphere, and (the essential part of) $\mathcal{M}$ corresponds to its restriction to an open hemisphere with respect to the "equator" defined by g. While the notion of oriented matroids is a combinatorial abstraction of a linear hyperplane arrangement, that of affine oriented matroids is an abstraction of *affine* hyperplane arrangements.

An affine hyperplane arrangement $\mathcal{H} = \{H_1, \ldots, H_n\}$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$ decomposes $\mathbb{R}^d$ into finite number of cells, and the *bounded complex* of $\mathcal{H}$ is the union of bounded cells. An affine oriented matroid $\mathcal{M}$ also has the bounded complex $X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$, which is a finite regular CW complex. (In the very formal definition, the bounded complex of $\mathcal{M}$ is the face poset $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$ of $X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$.) It is known that $X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ is always contractible ([2, Theorem 4.5.7]). Dong [4] showed that if $\mathcal{M}$ is *uniform* then $X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ is homeomorphic to a ball. When $\mathcal{M}$ is given by a hyperplane arrangement, this fact was first conjectured by Zaslavsky [18]. The affine oriented matroid given by a hyperplane arrangement $\mathcal{H}$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$ is uniform, if $\dim(H_{i_1} \cap \cdots \cap H_{i_s}) = d - s$ (resp. $H_{i_1} \cap \cdots \cap H_{i_s} = \emptyset$) for all $s \leq d$ (resp. $s > d$) and all $1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_s \leq n$. However, it seems that $X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ satisfies nice properties for wider class of affine oriented matroids. This is one of the motivations of the present paper.

Novik-Postnikov-Sturmfels [10] associates an affine oriented matroid $\mathcal{M} = ([n] \cup \{g\}, \mathcal{L}, g)$ to a squarefree monomial ideal $O_{\mathcal{M}}$ of $\widetilde{S} := \Bbbk[x_1, \ldots, x_n, y_1, \ldots, y_n]$ over a field $\Bbbk$ (if $\mathcal{M}$ is given by an affine hyperplane arrangement, then n is the number of hyperplanes). Among

This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 24740013, 15K17514, 25400057, 16K05114.



FIGURE 1. The bounded complex $X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$

other things, they proved that a $\mathbb{Z}^{2n}$-graded minimal free resolution of $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$ is supported by $X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$. For example, let $\mathcal{M}$ be the affine oriented matroid associated with the line arrangement in Figure 1. Then $\mathcal{M}$ is uniform, and $O_{\mathcal{M}} = (x_1x_2, x_1y_3, x_1x_4, x_2x_3, x_2y_4, x_3x_4) \subset \widetilde{S} = \Bbbk[x_1, \ldots, x_4, y_1, \ldots, y_4]$. The bounded complex $X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ is the shaded part of Figure 1, and it supports the minimal free resolution $0 \to \widetilde{S}^3 \to \widetilde{S}^8 \to \widetilde{S}^6 \to \widetilde{S} \to 0$ of $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$.

Novik et al. also showed that if g is in *general position* in $\mathcal{M}$, then $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$ is Cohen–Macaulay. It is not easy to explain the condition that g is in general position to novice readers, but this is much weaker than that $\mathcal{M}$ is uniform. When $\mathcal{M}$ comes from a line arrangement $l_1, \ldots, l_n$ in $\mathbb{R}^2$, g is in general position if and only if l_i and l_j are not parallel for all $l_i \neq l_j$.

One of the main results of the present paper is the following.

- Under a mild condition, $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$ is Cohen–Macaulay if and only if g is in general position in $\mathcal{M}$. In other words, the converse of the above mentioned result of Novik et al. is essentially true (Theorem 4.9).

Recall that we say a finite regular CW complex $X^{(*)}$ is Cohen–Macaulay over $\Bbbk$, if the Stanley-Reisner ring $\Bbbk[\Delta]$ is Cohen–Macaulay for some (equivalently, all) triangulation Δ of $X^{(*)}$. We will also show the following.

- If $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$ is Cohen–Macaulay, then the bonded complex $X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ is Cohen–Macaulay (Theorem 3.6), while the converse does not hold.
- If $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$ is Cohen–Macaulay then $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}} \otimes_{\widetilde{S}} \widetilde{S}/(x_i - y_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq n)$ is the Staley-Reisner ring of the simplicial complex of an ordinary matroid (Theorem 4.6).

If (the underlying space of) a CW complex $X^{(*)}$ is homeomorphic to a ball then it is contractible and Cohen–Macaulay, while the converse is not true. In the last section, we study the following natural question: If $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$ is Cohen–Macaulay, is $X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ homeomorphic to a ball? Related to this problem, we give a description of the canonical module $\omega_{\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}}$ under the assumption that $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$ is Cohen–Macaulay. Using this description, we show the following.

- If $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$ is Cohen–Macaulay, then $X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ is a contractible homology manifold with boundary over $\mathbb{Z}$ (Corollary 6.3).
- Assume that $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$ is Cohen–Macaulay. For the simplicial complex $\Delta_{\mathcal{M}}$ whose Stanley–Reisner ring is $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$, the geometric realization of $\Delta_{\mathcal{M}}$ is a homology manifold with boundary. Moreover, the boundary is a homology sphere in the sense of (6.2) below (Theorem 6.11).

From known results like [9], it is easy to verify that, when $\dim X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}) = 2$, or $\dim X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}) = 3$ and $\mathcal{M}$ comes from an affine plane arrangement in $\mathbb{R}^3$, if $X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ is Cohen–Macaulay then it is homeomorphic to a ball.

2. Preliminary

In this paper, we mainly treat an affine oriented matroid. To introduce it, let us first recall definitions and some basic notions on ordinary matroids and oriented matroids that we will need in this paper. See [2, 11, 15, 16] for details and unexplained terminology.

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and set $[n] := \{1, \ldots, n\}$. A (abstract) *simplicial complex* Δ on $[n]$ is a subset of $2^{[n]}$ such that $F, G \subseteq [n]$, $F \subseteq G$, $G \in \Delta$ imply $F \in \Delta$. Let $S := \Bbbk[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ be a polynomial ring over a field $\Bbbk$ with indeterminates $x_1, \ldots, x_n$. For $F \subseteq [n]$, we set $x_F := \prod_{i \in F} x_i$. The *Stanley–Reisner ideal* I_Δ of Δ is the ideal $I_\Delta = (x_F \mid F \in 2^{[n]} \setminus \Delta)$ of S, and the quotient ring $\Bbbk[\Delta] := S/I_\Delta$ is called the *Stanley–Reisner ring* of Δ. Clearly, I_Δ is always squarefree, i.e., generated by some monomials of the form x_F, and conversely for any squarefree monomial ideal I of S, there exists a unique simplicial complex Δ on $[n]$ such that $I_\Delta = I$.

A (ordinary) *matroid* on $[n]$ is a pair $M := ([n], \Delta)$ consisting of $[n]$ and a simplicial complex Δ on $[n]$ satisfying the following equivalent conditions:

- $\Delta|_F$ is pure for all $F \subseteq [n]$,
- $\Delta|_F$ is Cohen–Macaulay for all $F \subseteq [n]$, and
- $\Delta|_F$ is shellable for all $F \subseteq [n]$,

where $\Delta|_F := \{G \in \Delta \mid G \subseteq F\}$. If there is no fear of confusion, we refer to Δ as a matroid. The facets of Δ are called *bases* of M and the *rank* of M, denoted by $\operatorname{rank} M$, is defined to be the cardinality of bases. The inclusion-minimal elements in $2^{[n]} \setminus \Delta$ are called *circuits* of M. Clearly C is a circuit of M if and only if $x_C \in G(I_\Delta)$, where $G(I_\Delta)$ denotes the minimal set of monomial generators of I_Δ.

The circuit set $\mathcal{C}$ of a matroid is characterized as follows: The set $\mathcal{C} \subseteq 2^E$ is the circuit set of some matroid if and only if $\mathcal{C}$ satisfies the following conditions;

- $\varnothing \notin \mathcal{C}$.
- If $C_1, C_2 \in \mathcal{C}$ and $C_1 \subseteq C_2$, then $C_1 = C_2$.
- For $C_1, C_2 \in \mathcal{C}$ with $C_1 \neq C_2$ and $e \in C_1 \cap C_2$, there exists $C_3 \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $C_3 \subseteq (C_1 \cup C_2) \setminus \{e\}$.

For a matroid $M := ([n], \Delta)$ with the base set $\{F_1, \ldots, F_s\}$, let Δ^* be the simplicial complex with facets $\{[n] \setminus F_1, \ldots, [n] \setminus F_s\}$. It is well-known that the pair $M^* := ([n], \Delta^*)$ becomes a matroid again. The matroid M^* is called the *dual* of M. Clearly $\operatorname{rank} M + \operatorname{rank} M^* = n = \#[n]$.

A *sign vector* on $[n]$ is a function $\lambda : [n] \to \{0, -, +\}$. Let us remark that a sign vector is usually defined as a vector over $\{0, -, +\}$ indexed by a finite set (with some fixed linear ordering), but we adopt the definition above just for our convenience. The set of all the sign vectors on $[n]$ is denoted by $\{0, -, +\}^{[n]}$. For a sign vector $\lambda \in \{0, -, +\}^{[n]}$, we set

$\mathrm{supp}(\lambda) := \lambda^{-1}(\{-,+\})$ and call it the *support* of λ. The symbol $\mathbf{0}$ denotes the sign vector with the empty support, called the *zero vector*. For convenience, we consider the natural multiplication on $\{0,-,+\}$ as follows:

$$++ = -- = +,\ +- = -+ = -,\ +0 = 0+ = -0 = 0- = 0.$$

The *opposite* $-\lambda$ of λ is the sign vector given by $(-\lambda)(i) = -\lambda(i)$ for all $i \in [n]$. Defining $0 < +$, $0 < -$ with $+$ and $-$ incomparable, we have a partial order $\leq$ on $\{0,-,+\}$. By abuse of notation, let $\leq$ denote the partial order on $\{0,-,+\}^{[n]}$ defined as follows:

$$\lambda \leq \mu \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \lambda(i) \leq \mu(i) \quad \text{for all } i \in [n].$$

With this order, the sign vector $\mathbf{0}$ is the least in $\{0,-,+\}^{[n]}$. For two sign vector λ, μ, their *composition* $\lambda \circ \mu$ is the sign vector defined as follows:

$$(\lambda \circ \mu)(e) := \begin{cases} \mu(e) & e \notin \mathrm{supp}(\lambda), \\ \lambda(e) & e \in \mathrm{supp}(\lambda). \end{cases}$$

It is clear that $\lambda \circ \mu \geq \lambda$ for all $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{L}$. For $i \in [n]$ and $\lambda, \mu \in \{0,-,+\}^{[n]}$, it follows from the definition that $(\lambda \circ \mu)(i) = (\mu \circ \lambda)(i)$ if and only if i does not belong to the set

$$S(\lambda, \mu) := \{j \in [n] \mid \lambda(j) = -\mu(j) \neq 0\},$$

called the *separation set* of λ and μ. It is an easy exercise to show the equivalence of the following three conditions:

- $\lambda \circ \mu = \mu \circ \lambda$,
- $S(\lambda, \mu) = \varnothing$, and
- λ, μ have the join in $\{0,-,+\}^{[n]}$.

If these are the cases, $\lambda \circ \mu$ becomes the join of λ and μ.

Now we can state the definition of an oriented matroid in terms of covector axioms. A pair $\mathcal{M} = ([n], \mathcal{L})$ of a finite set $[n]$ and a set $\mathcal{L}$ of some sign vectors is said to be an *oriented matroid* (on $[n]$) if the following axioms, called *Covector Axioms*, are satisfied.

Axiom 2.1 (Covector Axioms)**.**

(L0) $\mathbf{0} \in \mathcal{L}$,
(L1) $\lambda \in \mathcal{L}$ implies $-\lambda \in \mathcal{L}$,
(L2) $\lambda \circ \mu \in \mathcal{L}$ for any $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{L}$, and
(L3) for $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{L}$ and $i \in S(\lambda, \mu)$, there exists $\nu \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $\nu(i) = 0$ and $\nu(j) = \lambda \circ \mu(j) = \mu \circ \lambda(j)$ for all $j \in [n] \setminus S(\lambda, \mu)$.

For a subset $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \{0,-,+\}^E$, let $\mathrm{Min}\, \mathcal{V}$ denote the set of the support-inclusion minimal elements in $\mathcal{V}$. For an oriented matroid $\mathcal{M} := ([n], \mathcal{L})$, the elements of the set $\mathcal{C} := \mathrm{Min}(\mathcal{L} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\})$ are called *cocircuits* of $\mathcal{M}$. A *loop* of $\mathcal{M}$ is an element $e \in [n]$ such that $\lambda(e) = 0$ for any cocircuit λ and a *coloop* of $\mathcal{M}$ is such that $\mathrm{supp}(\lambda) = \{e\}$ for some cocircuit λ.

It is noteworthy that the cocircuit set $\mathcal{C}$ coincides with the set $\mathrm{Min}_{\leq}(\mathcal{L} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\})$ of the elements of $\mathcal{L} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ that are minimal with respect to $\leq$; indeed the inclusion $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathrm{Min}_{\leq}(\mathcal{L} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\})$ is clear, and the inverse one is verified as follows. Suppose $\mathcal{C} \subsetneq \mathrm{Min}_{\leq}(\mathcal{L} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\})$ and take any $\lambda \in \mathrm{Min}_{\leq}(\mathcal{L} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}) \setminus \mathcal{C}$. Among the sign vectors $\mu \in \mathcal{L}$ with $\varnothing \neq \mathrm{supp}(\mu) \subsetneq \mathrm{supp}(\lambda)$, choose μ so that $S(\mu, \lambda)$ is minimal. If $S(\mu, \lambda) \neq \varnothing$, then taking $i \in S(\mu, \lambda)$ and applying Covector Axiom to i, μ, and λ, we would have $\nu \in \mathcal{L}$ with $\mathrm{supp}(\lambda) \setminus \mathrm{supp}(\mu) \subseteq \mathrm{supp}(\nu) \subseteq \mathrm{supp}(\lambda) \setminus \{i\}$

and $S(\nu,\lambda) \subseteq S(\mu,\lambda) \setminus \{i\}$; it thus follows that $S(\mu,\lambda) = \varnothing$, which in turn would imply $\mathbf{0} \neq \mu \leq \lambda$, hence a contradiction.

It is well-known that the set $\mathcal{C}$ of cocircuits is characterized as follows: A set $\mathcal{C}$ of some sign vectors is the set of the cocircuits of some oriented matroid if and only if it satisfies the following axioms, called *Circuit Axioms*:

Axiom 2.2 (Circuit Axioms (strong version))**.**

(C0) $\mathbf{0} \notin \mathcal{C}$,
(C1) $\lambda \in \mathcal{C}$ implies $-\lambda \in \mathcal{C}$,
(C2) $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\operatorname{supp}(\lambda) \subseteq \operatorname{supp}(\mu)$ implies $\lambda = \mu$ or $\lambda = -\mu$, and
(C3) (strong elimination) for $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{C}$, $i \in S(\lambda,\mu)$, and $j \in (\operatorname{supp}(\lambda) \cup \operatorname{supp}(\mu)) \setminus S(\lambda,\mu)$, there exists $\nu \in \mathcal{C}$ such that
  (a) $\nu(i) = 0$,
  (b) $j \in \operatorname{supp}(\nu)$, and
  (c) $\nu(k) = \lambda(k)$ or $\nu(k) = \mu(k)$, for $k \in \operatorname{supp}(\nu)$.

Note that the sets

$$\underline{\mathcal{C}} := \{\operatorname{supp}(\lambda) \subseteq [n] \mid \lambda \in \mathcal{C}\}$$

and $[n]$ form the ordinary matroid $([n], \underline{\mathcal{C}})$ (in terms of circuit axiom). The dual matroid of $([n], \underline{\mathcal{C}})$ is called the *underlying matroid* and denoted by $\underline{\mathcal{M}}$. The *rank* of matroid $\mathcal{M}$ is defined to be that of $\underline{\mathcal{M}}$.

Remark 2.3. Following [3, 10] and [2, Section 4], we will use terminologies on oriented matroid in the dual form (for oriented matroids, their dual can be defined. See [2] for details). The reader should take care some differences in notation and concepts when he/she refers to [2, Section 3].

In the view of the above, the cocircuit set of $\mathcal{M}$ should be denoted by $\mathcal{C}^*$; nevertheless we prefer to use $\mathcal{C}$.

Set $\widehat{\mathcal{L}} := \mathcal{L} \cup \{\hat{1}\}$, where $\hat{1}$ is the new greatest element.

Proposition 2.4 (cf. [2, Theorem 4.1.14])**.** *The set $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}$ is a graded lattice of rank* $\operatorname{rank}\mathcal{M}+1$ *and all intervals of length 2 in $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}$ has cardinality 4.*

Proposition 2.4 implies that $\mathcal{L}$ is equipped with a rank function, which is denoted by ρ.

For a sign vector $\lambda \in \{0,-,+\}^{[n]}$ and a subset $F \subseteq [n]$, let $\lambda|_F$ be the *restriction* of λ to F, that is, the sign vector on F with $\lambda|_F(e) = \lambda(e)$ for all $e \in F$. For an oriented matroid $\mathcal{M} = ([n], \mathcal{C})$ and its covector set $\mathcal{L}$, we set

$$\mathcal{C}|_F := \operatorname{Min}\{\lambda|_F \mid \lambda \in \mathcal{C},\ F \cap \operatorname{supp}(\lambda) \neq \varnothing\}, \quad \mathcal{L}|_F := \{\lambda|_F \mid \lambda \in \mathcal{L}\}.$$

The pair $\mathcal{M}|_F := (F, \mathcal{L}|_F)$ is then an oriented matroid on F with the covector set $\mathcal{L}|_F$ and called the *restriction* of $\mathcal{M}$ to F. Note that the set of cocircuits of $\mathcal{M}|_F$ is equal to $\mathcal{C}|_F$.

A *single element extension* of an oriented matroid $\mathcal{M}$ on $[n]$ is an oriented matroid $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ on $[n] \cup \{g\}$, where g is a new element, such that $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}|_{[n]} = \mathcal{M}$.

A single element extensions $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ of $\mathcal{M}$ is said to be *non-trivial* if the additional element g is not a coloop, or equivalently $\operatorname{rank}\widetilde{\mathcal{M}} = \operatorname{rank}\mathcal{M}$.

Example 2.5 (linear hyperplane arrangement)**.** Let $\{H_1, \ldots, H_n\}$ be a linear hyperplane arrangement in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and $h_1, \ldots, h_n$ be the vectors defining $H_1, \ldots, H_n$. Set $[n] := \{1, \ldots, n\}$. Each vector v in $\mathbb{R}^d$ defines the sign vector $\lambda_v \in \{0, -, +\}^{[n]}$ as follows:

$$\lambda_v(i) := \begin{cases} + & \text{if } \langle h_i, v\rangle > 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } \langle h_i, v\rangle = 0, \\ - & \text{if } \langle h_i, v\rangle < 0. \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

It is easy to verify that $\{\lambda_v \mid v \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ satisfies covector axioms. Thus the pair $([n], \{\lambda_v \mid v \in \mathbb{R}^d\})$ is an oriented matroid.

An affine oriented matroid is a triple $([n] \cup \{g\}, \mathcal{L}, g)$ consisting of a finite set $[n]$, a set $\mathcal{L}$ of some sign vectors, and the distinguished element g such that $([n] \cup \{g\}, \mathcal{L})$ is an oriented matroid and g is not a loop. The *positive part* $\mathcal{L}^+$ of $\mathcal{M}$ and the *bounded complex* $\mathcal{B}_\mathcal{M}$ of $\mathcal{M}$ are, by definition,

$$\mathcal{L}^+ := \{\lambda \in \mathcal{L} \mid \lambda(g) = +\}, \quad \mathcal{B}_\mathcal{M} := \{\lambda \in \mathcal{L}^+ \mid (\mathbf{0}, \lambda] \subseteq \mathcal{L}^+\},$$

where $(\mathbf{0}, \lambda] := \{\mu \in \mathcal{L} \mid \mathbf{0} < \mu \leq \lambda\}$.

Let $S := \Bbbk[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ be the polynomial ring over the field $\Bbbk$ with indeterminates $x_1, \ldots, x_n$, and set $\widetilde{S} := S \otimes_\Bbbk \Bbbk[y_1, \ldots, y_n]$, where $y_1, \ldots, y_n$ are variables. For a sign vector $\lambda \in \{0, -, +\}^{[n]}$, define

$$\mathsf{m}_\lambda := \prod_{i \in \lambda^{-1}(+) \setminus \{g\}} x_i \cdot \prod_{i \in \lambda^{-1}(-) \setminus \{g\}} y_i \in \widetilde{S},$$

where we set $\mathsf{m}_\mathbf{0} = 1$. For an affine oriented matroid $\mathcal{M} := ([n] \cup \{g\}, \mathcal{L}, g)$, the ideal

$$O_\mathcal{M} := (\mathsf{m}_\lambda \mid \lambda \in \mathcal{B}_\mathcal{M})$$

of $\widetilde{S}$ is called the *matroid ideal* of $\mathcal{M}$. Note that g is a coloop if and only if $O_\mathcal{M} = \widetilde{S}$.

Convention. Throughout this paper, unless otherwise stated, we tacitly assume that the distinguished element g of $\mathcal{M} = ([n] \cup \{g\}, \mathcal{L}, g)$ is not a coloop; hence it follows that $O_\mathcal{M} \neq \widetilde{S}$ and $\mathcal{M}$ is a non-trivial single element extension of $\mathcal{M}|_{[n]}$.

Since $\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{L}^+$ coincides with the set of the elements of $\mathcal{B}_\mathcal{M}$ that are minimal with respective to $\leq$, the following assertion holds true.

Lemma 2.6. *For an affine oriented matroid $\mathcal{M} := ([n] \cup \{g\}, \mathcal{L}, g)$ with cocircuit set $\mathcal{C}$, it follows that*

$$O_\mathcal{M} = (\mathsf{m}_\lambda \mid \lambda \in \mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{L}^+).$$

One of the most remarkable results in oriented matroid theory is the following shellability and sphericity theorem due to J. Edmonds, J. Folkman, J. Lawrence, and A. Mandel.

Theorem 2.7 (cf. [2, Theorem 4.3.3 and Proposition 4.7.24])**.** *Let $([n], \mathcal{L})$ be an oriented matroid of rank r. The poset $\mathcal{L}$ is isomorphic to the face poset of a shellable regular CW complex $X(\mathcal{L})$ the underlying space of which is a $(r-1)$-sphere. Moreover $X(\mathcal{L})$ is unique up to cellular homeomorphism.*

See Section 3 for the definition of regular CW complex. As for shellability, refer to [2, 4.7].

As a corollary, the bounded complex $\mathcal{B}_\mathcal{M} \cup \{\mathbf{0}\}$ of an affine oriented matroid $\mathcal{M}$ is isomorphic to the face poset of a regular CW complex that is a subcomplex of $X(\mathcal{L})$. We write $X(\mathcal{B}_\mathcal{M})$



FIGURE 2. $X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$



FIGURE 3. Section by H_g

to denote this complex and call it the *bounded complex* of $\mathcal{M}$ as the same with $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$ by abuse of terminology.

A typical example of $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$ and $X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ is the bounded complex of an affine hyperplane arrangement.

Example 2.8. Let $h_1 := (0,1,0)$, $h_2 := (-1,1,0)$, $h_3 := (1,0,0)$, $h_4 := (1,1,-1)$, $h_g := (0,0,1)$ be the vectors in $\mathbb{R}^3$, and H_1, H_2, H_3, H_4, H_g be the linear hyperplanes in $\mathbb{R}^3$ defined by these vectors, respectively. Setting $E := [4] \cup \{g\}$ and $\mathcal{L} := \{\lambda_v \mid v \in \mathbb{R}^3\}$, where λ_v is the function defined as in (2.1), we have the affine oriented matroid $\mathcal{M} := (E, \mathcal{L}, g)$.

The points in the same cell given by the hyperplanes H_1, H_2, H_3, H_4, H_g define the same sign vector, and hence the same monomial of $\widetilde{S}$. To obtain the bounded complex $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$, it thus suffices to consider the transversal section of the hyperplane arrangement by the hyperplane H'_g defined by $\langle h_g, - \rangle = 1$. The resulting section is just the affine hyperplane arrangement

$$\mathcal{A} := \left\{ H_1 \cap H'_g, H_2 \cap H'_g, H_3 \cap H'_g, H_4 \cap H'_g \right\}.$$

Figure 2 indicates the section by H'_g and Figure 3 that by H_g. The simplicial complex displayed in the shaded area and its face poset correspond to $X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ and $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$ respectively. The vertices in the figure correspond with the cocircuits λ of $\mathcal{M}$ with $\lambda(g) = +$, and hence $O_{\mathcal{M}} = (x_1x_2, x_1x_3, y_2x_3, y_4)$.

Example 2.9. Let $h_1 := (1,0,1)$, $h_2 := (1,0,-1)$, $h_3 := (-1,1,0)$, $h_4 := (1,1,0)$, $h_g := (0,0,1)$ be the vectors in $\mathbb{R}^3$ and H_1, H_2, H_3, H_4, H_g the linear hyperplanes defined by h_1, h_2, h_3, h_4, h_g, respectively. Set $E := [4] \cup \{g\}$ and let $(E, \mathcal{L})$ be the oriented matroid defined by the hyperplane arrangement $\{H_1, H_2, H_3, H_4, H_g\}$. The triple $\mathcal{M} := (E, \mathcal{L}, g)$ is then an affine oriented matroid. Figures 4 and 5 show the sections by $\langle h_g, - \rangle = 1$ and H_g.

As Figure 4 indicates, $O_{\mathcal{M}} = (x_1x_4, x_1y_2, x_1y_3, y_2x_3, y_2y_4)$.

For a sign vector λ and a subset $F \subseteq [n]$, let λ_F be the sign vector on $[n]$ defined as follows:

$$\lambda_F(i) := \begin{cases} \lambda_F(i) & \text{if } i \in F, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The following remarkable properties on covectors are proved by Dong in [3].

Theorem 2.10 (cf. [3, Theorem 3.2])**.** *Let $([n] \cup \{g\}, \mathcal{L}, g)$ be an affine oriented matroid and $\lambda \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$ a maximal covector in $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$.*



FIGURE 4. $X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$



FIGURE 5. Section by H_g

(1) $\mu_{\lambda^{-1}(0)}, \mu_{\mathrm{supp}(\lambda)} \in \mathcal{L}$ *for any* $\mu \in \mathcal{L}$.
(2) $\mathrm{supp}(\nu) \subseteq \mathrm{supp}(\lambda)$ *for all* $\nu \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$.

In their paper [10], I. Novik, A. Postnikov, and B. Sturmfels showed that $O_{\mathcal{M}}$ has a minimal cellular $\widetilde{S}$-free resolution supported by the regular CW complex $X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ (see Section 3 for the definition of cellular resolutions).

Theorem 2.11 (Novik–Postnikov–Sturmfels [10, Theorem 2.2])**.** *Let* $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$ *be the bounded complex of an affine oriented matroid* $\mathcal{M} := ([n] \cup \{g\}, \mathcal{L}, g)$*, and let* $\mathrm{gr} : \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}} \longrightarrow \mathbb{N}^{2n}$ *be the function defined as* $\mathrm{gr}(\lambda) := \deg(\mathsf{m}_\lambda)$*. The pair* $(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}} \cup \{\mathbf{0}\}, \mathrm{gr})$ *then gives a minimal cellular resolution of* $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$ *supported by* $X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$.

A single element extension is uniquely determined by sign function on cocircuits.

Theorem 2.12 (Les Vergnas (cf. [2, Proposition 7.1.4]))**.** *Let* $\mathcal{M} := ([n] \cup \{g\}, \mathcal{L})$ *be a single element extension of* $\mathcal{M}|_{[n]} := ([n], \mathcal{L}|_{[n]})$*, and* $\mathcal{C}$ *the set of cocircuits of* $\mathcal{M}$*. Note that the cocircuit set of* $\mathcal{M}|_{[n]}$ *is then* $\mathcal{C}|_{[n]}$*. There exists a unique function* $\mathrm{sgn} : \mathcal{C}|_{[n]} \to \{0, -, +\}$ *such that*

(1) $\mathrm{sgn}(-\lambda) = -\mathrm{sgn}(\lambda)$ *for all* $\lambda \in \mathcal{C}|_{[n]}$*, and*
(2) $\mathcal{C}$ *is partitioned into two following sets:*

$$\mathcal{C}_1 := \left\{(\lambda, \mathrm{sgn}(\lambda)) \mid \lambda \in \mathcal{C}|_{[n]}\right\},$$
$$\mathcal{C}_2 := \left\{ (\lambda_1 \circ \lambda_2, 0) \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{l} \lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathcal{C}|_{[n]},\ \mathrm{sgn}(\lambda_1) = -\mathrm{sgn}(\lambda_2) \neq 0, \\ S(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = \varnothing,\ \rho(\lambda_1 \circ \lambda_2) = 2 \end{array} \right\}.$$

Here for $\mu \in \mathcal{C}|_{[n]}$ *and* $t \in \{0, -, +\}$*,* $\mu' := (\mu, t)$ *denotes the sign vector on* $[n] \cup \{g\}$ *such that*

$$\mu'(i) = \begin{cases} \mu(i) & \text{for } i \in [n], \\ t & \text{for } i = g. \end{cases}$$

In the situation of Theorem 2.12, the function $\mathrm{sgn} : \mathcal{C}|_{[n]} \to \{0, -, +\}$ is called a *localization* of $\mathcal{M}$, and g is said to be *general position* if $\mathrm{sgn}(\lambda) \neq 0$ for all $\lambda \in \mathcal{C}|_{[n]}$. Besides Theorem 2.11, Novik et al. gave the following sufficient condition for Cohen–Macaulayness of $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$.

Theorem 2.13 (Novik–Postonikov–Sturmfels [10, Corollary 2.6])**.** *Let* $\mathcal{M} := ([n] \cup \{g\}, \mathcal{L}, g)$ *be an affine oriented matroid of rank* r *and assume* g *is neither a loop nor a coloop. Note*



FIGURE 6. $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$



FIGURE 7. Section by H_g

that $\mathcal{M}$ is then a single element extension of $\mathcal{M}|_{[n]}$. If g is in general position, then $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$ is Cohen–Macaulay of dimension of $2n - r$.

Remark 2.14. Let $\mathcal{H} = \{H_1, H_2, \ldots, H_n\}$ be an affine hyperplane arrangement in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Consider the euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^{d+1} = \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} = \{\, (x_1, \ldots, x_d, y) \mid x_1, \ldots, x_d, y \in \mathbb{R} \,\}$, and let $\widetilde{H}_g$ (resp. $\widetilde{H}'_g$) be the hyperplane of $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ defined by $y = 0$ (resp. $y = 1$). We identify the ambient space $\mathbb{R}^d$ of $\mathcal{H}$ with $\widetilde{H}'_g$, and regard each H_i as a subset of $\widetilde{H}'_g$. For each i, let $\widetilde{H_i}$ be the *linear* hyperplane of $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ spanned by $H_i\, (\subset \widetilde{H}'_g)$. If we fix the "orientation" of each $\widetilde{H_i}$, the linear hyperplane arrangement $\{\widetilde{H}_1, \widetilde{H}_2, \ldots, \widetilde{H}_n, \widetilde{H}_g\}$ gives an oriented matroid $([n] \cup \{g\}, \mathcal{L})$. In the sense of Examples 2.8 or 2.9, the affine oriented matroid $([n] \cup \{g\}, \mathcal{L}, g)$ corresponds to $\mathcal{H}$. If $\mathcal{H}$ is a central arrangement (i.e., $\bigcap_{i=1}^n H_i \neq \varnothing$), then g is a coloop. So we have to assume that $\mathcal{H}$ is *not* central.

For each i, let L_i be the linear hyperplane of $\mathbb{R}^d$ which is parallel to H_i, and $\mathcal{H}_0 = \{L_1, \ldots, L_n\}$ the linear hyperplane arrangement in $\mathbb{R}^d$. (If H_i and H_j are parallel, then $L_i = L_j$. However, we distinguish them here.) Clearly, $\mathcal{H}_0$ is isomorphic to the hyperplane arrangement $\{\widetilde{H}_1 \cap \widetilde{H}_g, \ldots, \widetilde{H}_n \cap \widetilde{H}_g\}$ in $\widetilde{H}_g\, (\cong \mathbb{R}^d)$. Recall that the hyperplane arrangement $\mathcal{H}$ and a point $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ give the sign vector $\lambda_v^{\mathcal{H}} \in \{0, -, +\}^{[n]}$, and the same is true for $\mathcal{H}_0$ (see the above Examples). Then g is in general position in $\mathcal{M}$ if and only if $(\{\lambda_v^{\mathcal{H}_0} \mid v \in \mathbb{R}^d\} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}) \subseteq \{\lambda_v^{\mathcal{H}} \mid v \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ holds as subsets of $\{0, -, +\}^{[n]}$.

Let $L(\mathcal{H})$ be the set of all nonempty intersections of hyperplanes in $\mathcal{H}$. Assume that $\operatorname{rank} \mathcal{M} = d + 1$, equivalently, every inclusion minimal element of $L(\mathcal{H})$ is a point. In this case, it is easy to see that g is in general position if and only if no two distinct lines in $L(\mathcal{H})$ are parallel.

Unfortunately, the converse of Theorem 2.13 is false in general.

Example 2.15. Let $h_1 := (1, 0, 1)$, $h_2 := (-1, 0, 1)$, $h_3 := (0, 1, 0)$, $h_g := (0, 0, 1)$ be the vectors in $\mathbb{R}^3$ and H_1, H_2, H_3, H_g be the linear hyperplanes defined by h_1, h_2, h_3, h_g, respectively. As Figures 6 and 7 show, $O_{\mathcal{M}} = (x_1, x_2)$ and g is not in general position. On the other hand, $O_{\mathcal{M}} = (x_1, x_2)$ is clearly Cohen–Macaulay.

3. $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$ is Cohen–Macaulay implies $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$ is Cohen–Macaulay

Our next goal is to show that if $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$ is Cohen–Macaulay then $X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ is Cohen–Macaulay as a topological space. To do this, we recall and develop the theory of cellular free resolutions of monomial ideals.

First, we recall the definition of a regular CW complex. Let $\mathbb{B}^d$ denote the d-dimensional closed ball, $\mathrm{int}(\mathbb{B}^d)$ its interior, and set $\partial\mathbb{B}^d := \mathbb{B}^d \setminus \mathrm{int}(\mathbb{B}^d)$. A subset σ of a topological space X is called an (open) *d-cell* if there exists a continuous map $f_\sigma : \mathbb{B}^d \to X$ whose restriction to $\mathrm{int}(\mathbb{B}^d)$ induces a homeomorphism onto σ. For such cell σ, we set $\dim \sigma := d$ and refer to the continuous map f_σ as the *characteristic map* of σ.

Definition 3.1. A *finite regular CW complex* is a Hausdorff space X together with a finite set $X^{(*)}$ of cells of X satisfying the following conditions:

(0) $\varnothing \in X^{(*)}$ (the convention of the present paper). We regard $\varnothing$ as the -1-cell:
(1) $X = \bigcup_{\sigma \in X^{(*)}} \sigma$:
(2) $\sigma \cap \tau = \varnothing$ for $\sigma, \tau \in X^{(*)}$ with $\sigma \neq \tau$:
(3) for each $\sigma \in X^{(d)}$ and its characteristic map f_σ,
$$f_\sigma(\partial\mathbb{B}^d) \subseteq X^{\leq d-1},$$
where $X^{(k)} := \big\{\tau \in X^{(*)} \mid \dim \tau = k\big\}$ and $X^{\leq d-1} := \bigcup_{k \leq d-1} \big(\bigcup_{\tau \in X^{(k)}} \tau\big)$.
(4) for each $\sigma \in X^{(d)}$, the corresponding characteristic map f_σ can be chosen to be a homeomorphism from $\mathbb{B}^d$ to the closure $\overline{\sigma}$ of σ.

We regard $X^{(*)}$ as a partially ordered set by $\sigma \geq \tau \overset{\text{def}}{\iff} \overline{\sigma} \supset \tau$. For an affine oriented matroid $\mathcal{M}$, there is a regular CW complex $X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ which is isomorphic to $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}} \cup \{\mathbf{0}\}$ as posets. (For the convenience, the cell of $X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ corresponding to $\lambda \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$ is sometimes denoted just by λ.) The underlying space of the CW complex $X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ is uniquely determined by $\mathcal{M}$ up to homeomorphism.

Recall that $S = \Bbbk[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ is a polynomial ring. In the rest of this section, let $X^{(*)}$ be a finite regular CW complex. Let $\mathrm{gr} : X^{(*)} \to \mathbb{N}^n$ be an order preserving map with $\mathrm{gr}(\varnothing) = \mathbf{0}$. Here $\mathbb{N}^n$ is ordered by componentwise comparison. Now we define the $\mathbb{Z}^n$-graded chain complex $\mathcal{F}^X_\bullet$ of free S-modules as follows: set
$$\mathcal{F}^X_i := \bigoplus_{\sigma \in X^{(i-1)}} S(-\mathrm{gr}(\sigma))\, e_\sigma,$$
where e_σ is an S-free basis, and define the differential map $\partial_i : \mathcal{F}^X_i \to \mathcal{F}^X_{i-1}$ by
$$e_\sigma \longmapsto \sum_{\tau \in X^{(i-2)}} [\sigma : \tau] \cdot x^{\mathrm{gr}(\sigma) - \mathrm{gr}(\tau)} \cdot e_\tau,$$
where we set $x^{\boldsymbol{a}} = \prod_{i=1}^n x_i^{a_i} \in S$ for $\boldsymbol{a} = (a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$ and $[\sigma : \tau] \in \mathbb{Z}$ denotes the coefficient of τ in the image of σ by the differential map in the cellular homology of $X^{(*)}$. In other words, $[- : -]$ is an *incidence function* of the regular CW complex $X^{(*)}$. In this situation, we have $\sigma \gtrdot \tau$, if and only if $[\sigma : \tau] \neq 0$, if and only if $[\sigma : \tau] = \pm 1$. Clearly, $H^0(\mathcal{F}^X_\bullet) \cong S/I$, where I is the monomial ideal generated by $\{x^{\mathrm{gr}(v)} \mid v \in X^{(0)}\}$. If $\mathcal{F}^X_\bullet$ is acyclic, then it gives a free resolution of S/I. In this case, we call $\mathcal{F}^X_\bullet$ a *cellular resolution* of S/I supported by $X^{(*)}$.

Definition 3.2. With the above situation, we say a cellular resolution $\mathcal{F}_\bullet^X$ is *faithful*, if the following are satisfied

(1) gr is injective,
(2) $\mathrm{gr}(\sigma) > \mathrm{gr}(\tau)$ implies $\sigma > \tau$.

It is easy to see that if a cellular resolution $\mathcal{F}_\bullet^X$ is faithful then it is a minimal free resolution. The Novik-Postnikov-Sturmfels resolution $\mathcal{F}_\bullet^{X(\mathcal{B}_\mathcal{M})}$ of $\widetilde{S}/O_\mathcal{M}$ given by $\mathrm{gr} : \lambda \mapsto \deg(\mathsf{m}_\lambda)$ (see Theorem 2.11) is faithful. In fact, $\lambda \in \mathcal{B}_\mathcal{M}$ is a function $[n] \to \{0, -, +\}$ (formally, it is a function $[n] \cup \{g\} \to \{0, -, +\}$, but $\lambda(g) = +$ for all $\lambda \in \mathcal{B}_\mathcal{M}$, so g is a dummy in this sense), and hence m_λ, $\mathrm{gr}(\lambda)$ and λ itself are essentially the same data.

We say a subset Y of $X^{(*)}$ is an *order filter*, if $\sigma \in X^{(*)}$, $\tau \in Y$ and $\sigma \geq \tau$ imply $\sigma \in Y$. Typical examples of order filters are the following.

(1) For $\sigma \in X^{(*)}$, $X^{\geq\sigma} := \{\, \tau \in X^{(*)} \mid \tau \geq \sigma \,\}$ is an order filter.
(2) For an order preserving map $\mathrm{gr} : X^{(*)} \to \mathbb{N}^n$, $X^{\geq \boldsymbol{a}} := \{\, \sigma \in X^{(*)} \mid \mathrm{gr}(\sigma) \geq \boldsymbol{a} \,\}$ is an order filter.

If $\mathcal{F}_\bullet^X$ is a faithful resolution, (1) is a special case of (2). In fact, we have $X^{\geq\sigma} = X^{\geq \mathrm{gr}(\sigma)}$ in this case.

For an order filter Y of $X^{(*)}$. Consider the cochain complex $C^\bullet(Y)$ of $\Bbbk$-vector spaces with

$$C^i(Y) := \bigoplus_{\sigma \in Y \cap X^{(i)}} \Bbbk\, \sigma$$

(here we regard $\sigma \in X^{(*)}$ as a basis element) and the differential map $\partial : C^i(Y) \to C^{i+1}(Y)$ is given by

$$\partial(\sigma) = \sum_{\tau \in Y \cap X^{(i+1)}} [\tau : \sigma]\, \tau.$$

Proposition 3.3. *Assume that a monomial ideal quotient S/I admits a cellular S-free resolution $\mathcal{F}_\bullet^X$ which is minimal. Then S/I is Cohen–Macaulay if and only if $H^i(C^\bullet(X^{\geq \boldsymbol{a}})) = 0$ for all $\boldsymbol{a} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ and all $i \neq \dim X$.*

Proof. It is well-known that S/I is Cohen–Macaulay if and only if $\mathrm{Ext}_S^i(S/I, S) = 0$ for all $i \neq \text{proj-dim}_S S/I$. Since $\mathcal{F}_\bullet^X$ is a minimal free resolution of S/I, we have $H^i(\mathrm{Hom}_S^\bullet(\mathcal{F}_\bullet^X, S)) \cong \mathrm{Ext}_S^i(S/I, S)$ and $\text{proj-dim}_S S/I = \dim X + 1$. Hence S/I is Cohen–Macaulay if and only if $H^i(\mathrm{Hom}_S^\bullet(\mathcal{F}_\bullet^X, S)) = 0$ for all $i \neq \dim X + 1$. Since

$$\mathrm{Hom}_S^i(\mathcal{F}_\bullet^X, S) = \mathrm{Hom}_S(\mathcal{F}_i^X, S) \cong \bigoplus_{\tau \in X^{(i-1)}} S(\mathrm{gr}(\tau)),$$

we have

$$[\mathrm{Hom}_S^i(\mathcal{F}_\bullet^X, S)]_{-\boldsymbol{a}} \cong \bigoplus_{\substack{\tau \in X^{(i-1)} \\ \mathrm{gr}(\tau) \geq \boldsymbol{a}}} \Bbbk\, \tau$$

for all $\boldsymbol{a} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$. By the construction of the differential map of $\mathcal{F}_\bullet^X$, we have

$$[\mathrm{Hom}_S^\bullet(\mathcal{F}_\bullet^X, S)]_{-\boldsymbol{a}} \cong C^{\bullet - 1}(X^{\geq \boldsymbol{a}})$$

and hence

$$[\mathrm{Ext}_S^i(S/I, S)]_{-\boldsymbol{a}} \cong H^{i-1}(C^\bullet(X^{\geq \boldsymbol{a}})).$$

So we are done. □

Note that in the case where $X^{(*)}$ is a simplicial complex, for $\sigma \in X^{(*)}$, the complex $C^\bullet(X^{\geq\sigma})$ coincides with the $\Bbbk$-dual of the complex given by shifting the augmented chain complex of the link of σ, and hence its cohomologies are isomorphic to $H^i(X, X \setminus \{x\}; \Bbbk)$ for any x belonging to the relative interior of σ whenever the link is not empty (cf. [7, Lemma 63.1]). This fact can be generalized to a finite regular CW complex as follows.

Proposition 3.4. *Let $X^{(*)}$ be a finite regular CW complex. For $\sigma \in X^{(*)}$, it follows that*

$$H^i(C^\bullet(X^{\geq\sigma})) \cong \begin{cases} \widetilde{H}^i(X; \Bbbk) & \text{if } \sigma = \varnothing, \\ H^i(X, X \setminus \{x\}; \Bbbk) & \text{for any } x \in \sigma \text{ if } \sigma \neq \varnothing \end{cases}$$

for all i.

Proof. The case where $\sigma = \varnothing$ is clear. Assume $\sigma \neq \varnothing$ and $x \in \sigma$. Let A be the subspace of X corresponding to the subcomplex $\{\tau \in X \mid \tau \not\geq \sigma\}$. Clearly $x \notin A$ and

$$H^i(X, A; \Bbbk) \cong H^i(C^\bullet(X^{\geq\sigma}))$$

for all i. Hence it suffices to show that the maps $H_i(X, A, \Bbbk) \to H_i(X, X \setminus \{x\}; \Bbbk)$ induced from the inclusions $A \subseteq X \setminus \{x\} \subseteq X$ are isomorphisms for all i. Henceforth every isomorphism is the one induced from inclusion. By a standard argument with the universal coefficient theorem and the five lemma (cf. [14, Corollary 5.3.15]), the assertion above holds true if $H_i(X, A, \mathbb{Z}) \cong H_i(X, X \setminus \{x\}; \mathbb{Z})$ for all i. As is well-known (cf. [14, Lemma 6.8.6]), the long exact sequence induced from $A \subseteq X \setminus \{x\} \subseteq X$ implies that $H_i(X, A; \mathbb{Z}) \cong H_i(X, X \setminus \{x\}; \mathbb{Z})$ for all i if and only if

$$H_i(A; \mathbb{Z}) \cong H_i(X \setminus \{x\}; \mathbb{Z})$$

for all i. Consequently we have only to show that the latter assertion holds true.

Set $\Gamma := X^{(*)} \setminus A^{(*)}$. The cell σ is then the least cell in Γ. Note that since X is regular, the closure $\overline{\tau}$ of each cell τ of X is homeomorphic to a closed ball through the characteristic map. Take a maximal cell τ_1 in Γ and let X_1 be the closed subset of X corresponding to the subcomplex $X^{(*)} \setminus \{\tau_1\}$. If $\tau_1 = \sigma$, then $X_1 = A$ and $X \setminus \{x\} = A \cup (\overline{\sigma} \setminus \{x\})$. Moreover $\partial\overline{\sigma} = A \cap (\overline{\sigma} \setminus \{x\})$ is a strong deformation retract of $\overline{\sigma} \setminus \{x\}$, and hence A is a strong deformation retract of $X \setminus \{x\}$. In the case where $\tau_1 \neq \sigma$, it follows that $x \in \partial\overline{\tau_1}$ and

$$(X_1 \setminus \{x\}) \cap (\overline{\tau_1} \setminus \{x\}) = \partial\overline{\tau_1} \setminus x.$$

For a closed ball B and its points p in ∂B, $\partial B \setminus \{p\}$ is a strong deformation retract of $B \setminus \{p\}$. Hence $\partial\overline{\tau_1} \setminus \{x\}$ is also a strong deformation retract of $\overline{\tau_1} \setminus \{x\}$. Consequently $X_1 \setminus \{x\}$ is a strong deformation retract of $X \setminus \{x\}$. Thus we can replace X by X_1 and Γ by $X_1^{(*)} \setminus A^{(*)}$.

This procedure stops by finite steps since Γ is a finite set. Therefore we conclude that $H_i(A; \mathbb{Z}) \cong H_i(X \setminus \{x\}; \mathbb{Z})$ for all i, as desired. □

A finite regular CW complex $X^{(*)}$ always admits a finite triangulation Δ (i.e., Δ is a finite simplicial complex whose geometric realization is homeomorphic to the underlying space X of $X^{(*)}$). In fact, we can take the barycentric subdivision. We say $X^{(*)}$ (or the underlying space X) is Cohen–Macaulay over $\Bbbk$, if the Stanley–Reisner ring $\Bbbk[\Delta]$ is Cohen–Macaulay (c.f. [15, p.58]). This is a topological condition which does not depend on the particular choice of Δ. In fact, X is Cohen–Macaulay over $\Bbbk$ if and only if

$$\widetilde{H}^i(X; \Bbbk) = H^i(X, X \setminus \{x\}; \Bbbk) = 0$$

for all $i < d := \dim X$ and all $x \in X$. This is a classical result of Munkres, see for example [15, II. Proposition 4.3]. In our setting we have the following.



FIGURE 8. $X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$

Lemma 3.5. *With the above notation, X is Cohen–Macaulay if and only if $H^i(C^\bullet(X^{\geq\sigma})) = 0$ for all $i \neq \dim X$ and all $\sigma \in X^{(*)}$.*

Proof. The assertions are immediate from Proposition 3.4 and the above remark on the Cohen–Macaulay property of a topological space. □

The following is one of the main results of the present paper.

Theorem 3.6. *Let $I \subset S$ be a monomial ideal. Assume that the quotient S/I admits a faithful cellular resolution $\mathcal{F}_\bullet^X$. If S/I is Cohen–Macaulay, then the supporting complex $X^{(*)}$ is Cohen–Macaulay over $\Bbbk$.*

Proof. By Proposition 3.3, we have $H^i(C^\bullet(X^{\geq\boldsymbol{a}})) = 0$ for all $\boldsymbol{a} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ and all $i \neq \dim X$. Since $\mathcal{F}_\bullet^X$ is faithful now, we have $X^{\geq\sigma} = X^{\geq \mathrm{gr}(\sigma)}$ for all $\sigma \in X^{(*)}$. Hence it follows that $H^i(C^\bullet(X^{\geq\sigma})) = 0$ for all $\sigma \in X^{(*)}$ and all $i \neq \dim X$. So the assertion follows from Lemma 3.5. □

Corollary 3.7. *Let $O_{\mathcal{M}}$ be the ideal associated with an affine oriented matroid $\mathcal{M}$. If $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$ is Cohen–Macaulay, then (the underlying space of) the bounded complex $X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ of $\mathcal{M}$ is Cohen–Macaulay.*

Proof. Recall that the Novik-Postnikov-Sturmfels resolution $\mathcal{F}_\bullet^{X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})}$ of $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$ is faithful. So the assertion is immediate from Theorem 3.6. □

In the next section, we will see that the Cohen–Macaulayness of $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$ does not depend on $\Bbbk$.

Remark 3.8. (1) The converse of Theorem 3.6 is far from true. For example, consider the affine oriented matroid $\mathcal{M}$ given by the affine hyperplane arrangement of Figure 8. Then the bounded complex $X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ is a square, and clearly Cohen–Macaulay. However, $O_{\mathcal{M}} = (x_1x_4, x_1x_3, y_2x_3, y_2x_4)$ is not Cohen–Macaulay, in fact a computation shows that $\dim \widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}} = 6$ and $\operatorname{depth} \widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}} = 5$. We can check this more theoretically. By Corollary 4.3 below, $\{x_i - y_i \mid i = 1, \ldots, 4\}$ forms an $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$-regular sequence. So it suffices to show that $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}} \otimes_{\widetilde{S}} \widetilde{S}/(x_i - y_i \mid i = 1, \ldots, 4)$ is not Cohen–Macaulay, but this ring is isomorphic to $\Bbbk[x_1, \ldots, x_4]/(x_1x_4, x_1x_3, x_2x_3, x_2x_4)$, which is the Stanley-Reisner ring of two (disjoint) 1-simplexes.

(2) As shown in [8], a minimal free resolution of the quotient S/I by a *generic monomial ideal* I is supported by a simplicial complex Δ_I called the *Scarf complex* of I. It is easy to see that $\mathcal{F}_\bullet^{\Delta_I}$ is faithful in the sense of Definition 3.2. Hence, by Theorem 3.6, if I is a Cohen–Macaulay generic monomial ideal, then Δ_I is Cohen–Macaulay. However a stronger result has been obtained. In fact, [8, Theorem 2.5] states that Δ_I is shellable in this situation. On the other hand, it is not homeomorphic to a ball, or even not a homology manifold. For example, $(x^3y^2, y^3z^2, z^3x^2, xyz)$ is a Cohen–Macaulay generic monomial ideal, but Δ_I consists of 3 line segments joined at a point. This is in contrast to the other examples appearing in this paper.

(3) We have no idea whether the faithfulness assumption is really necessary for Theorem 3.6. The Eliahou-Kervaire resolutions of stable monomial ideals are typical examples of non-faithful cellular resolutions. In this case, if S/I is Cohen–Macaulay, then the supporting CW complex $X^{(*)}$ is Cohen–Macaulay. In fact, the authors have shown that X is homeomorphic to a ball in this situation ([13]).

(4) Let $I \subset S$ be a strongly stable monomial ideal (i.e., a Borel fixed ideal in the $\mathrm{char}(\Bbbk) = 0$ case), and b-pol$(I) \subset T$ its *alternative polarization* (c.f. [12]). Here T is a larger polynomial ring. The authors constructed the "modified" Eliahou-Kervaire resolution of $T/\,$b-pol(I), and showed that this is cellular ([12, 13]). It is easy to see that this cellular structure is faithful, contrary to the original Eliahou-Kervaire resolution of S/I. Also here, if $T/\,$b-pol(I) is Cohen–Macaulay (equivalently, so is S/I), then the supporting CW complex is homeomorphic to a ball ([13]).

4. Cohen–Macaulayness of oriented matroid ideals

From the definition of $O_{\mathcal{M}}$, it is natural to expect the sequence $x_1 - y_1, \ldots, x_n - y_n$ to be regular on $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$. Novik et al. indeed showed that this is true when $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$ is Cohen–Macaulay ([10, Corollary 2.7]). In this section, we will show that the sequence is *always* regular on $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$. Furthermore we will give several characterizations of Cohen–Macaulayness of $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$.

Let us first recall the following lemma that can be found in [5].

Lemma 4.1 (cf. [5, Lemma 5.8])**.** *Let R, R' be noetherian rings and $f : R \to R'$ a homomorphism of rings. For a radical ideal I of R with minimal primary decomposition $I = \bigcap_{k=1}^{s} \mathfrak{p}_k$, it follows that $f(I) = \bigcap_{k=1}^{s} f(\mathfrak{p}_k)$ if $f(I)$ is radical.*

For $A \subseteq [n]$, we set $S[A] := S \otimes_{\Bbbk} \Bbbk\,[y_i \mid i \in A]$. Let $\mathcal{I}_A$ be the family of squarefree monomial ideals I of $S[A]$ satisfying the following properties:

(1) $x_i y_i \nmid \mathsf{m}$ for all $i \in A$ and $\mathsf{m} \in G(I)$.
(2) $\{x_i, y_i\} \not\subseteq \mathfrak{p}$ for all $i \in A$ and $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathrm{Ass}(S[A]/I)$.

Lemma 4.2. *The sequence $\{x_i - y_i\}_{i \in A}$ is regular on $S[A]/I$ for all $I \in \mathcal{I}_A$*

Proof. Let $\varphi_i : S[A] \to S[A \setminus \{i\}]$ be the canonical surjective ring homomorphism sending y_i to x_i and the other variables to themselves. For each $i \in A$ and ideal $J \in \mathcal{I}_A$, the element $x_i - y_i$ is regular on $S[A]/J$ since $x_i - y_i \notin \mathfrak{p}$ for all $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathrm{Ass}\,(S[A]/J)$. Moreover, through the isomorphism $S[A]/(x_i - y_i) \cong S[A \setminus \{i\}]$ induced by φ_i, we have the isomorphism

$$S[A]/J \otimes_{S[A]} S[A]/(x_i - y_i) \cong S[A \setminus \{i\}]/\varphi_i(J).$$

Thus we have only to show that $\varphi_i(I) \in \mathcal{I}_{A \setminus \{i\}}$ for all $i \in A$.

Let $i \in A$. Since I is squarefree and $x_i y_i \nmid \mathsf{m}$ for all $\mathsf{m} \in G(I)$, we have the decomposition $I = \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathrm{Ass}(S[A]/I)} \mathfrak{p}$ and the ideal of $\varphi_i(I)$ of $S[A \setminus \{i\}]$ is again squarefree. In particular $\varphi_i(I)$ is radical. It thus follows from Lemma 4.1 that $\varphi_i(I) = \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathrm{Ass}(S[A]/I)} \varphi_i(\mathfrak{p})$. By the definition of φ_i, each $\varphi_i(\mathfrak{p})$ is also prime. Hence $\varphi_i(I)$ inherits the property of I on generators and associated primes. Therefore $\varphi_i(I) \in \mathcal{I}_{A \setminus \{i\}}$. □

Let $\pi : \widetilde{S} \to S$ be the natural surjective map given by the specialization of y_i to x_i for each $i \in [n]$. Set $\overline{O_{\mathcal{M}}} := \pi(O_{\mathcal{M}})$. As one can easily verify, it follows that

$$\overline{O_{\mathcal{M}}} = \left(x_{\mathrm{supp}(\lambda) \setminus \{g\}} \mid \lambda \in \mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{L}^+\right) = \left(x_{F \setminus \{g\}} \mid F \in \underline{\mathcal{C}},\ g \in F\right).$$

As a corollary of the proposition above, the following holds.

Corollary 4.3. *For an affine oriented matroid $\mathcal{M} = ([n] \cup \{g\}, \mathcal{L}, g)$ such that g is not a coloop, the sequence $x_1 - y_1, \ldots, x_n - y_n$ is always regular on $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$. In particular, $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$ is Cohen–Macaulay if and only if so is $S/\overline{O_{\mathcal{M}}}$.*

Proof. We will show only the first assertion. The second is an immediate consequence of the first. By Lemma 4.2, it is enough to show that $O_{\mathcal{M}} \in \mathcal{I}_{[n]}$. Since g is not a coloop, the ideal $O_{\mathcal{M}}$ is a proper ideal of $\widetilde{S}$. Recall that $G(O_{\mathcal{M}}) = \{\mathsf{m}_\lambda \mid \lambda \in \mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{L}^+\}$. It thus follows that $x_i y_i \nmid \mathsf{m}$ for all $\mathsf{m} \in G(O_{\mathcal{M}})$ and $i \in [n]$.

Suppose there exists $i \in [n]$ and $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathrm{Ass}(\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}})$ such that $\{x_i, y_i\} \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$. Then we can find a monomial $u \in \widetilde{S} \setminus O_{\mathcal{M}}$ such that $x_i u \in O_{\mathcal{M}}$ and $y_i u \in O_{\mathcal{M}}$. Hence there exist $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{L}^+$ such that $x_i \mid \mathsf{m}_\lambda \mid x_i u$ and $y_i \mid \mathsf{m}_\mu \mid y_i u$. By strong elimination property, we have $\nu \in \mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{L}^+$ such that $\nu(i) = 0$ and $\nu(k) = \lambda(k)$ or $\nu(k) = \mu(k)$ for $k \in \mathrm{supp}(\nu)$. However this implies that $\mathsf{m}_\nu \mid (\mathrm{lcm}(\mathsf{m}_\lambda, \mathsf{m}_\mu)/(x_i y_i))$ and hence that $\mathsf{m}_\nu \mid u$. This is a contradiction.

Consequently $O_{\mathcal{M}} \in \mathcal{I}_{[n]}$. □

For $i \in [n]$, set $\mathcal{L}' := \{\lambda \in \mathcal{L} \mid \lambda(i) = 0\}$, and we sometimes regard it as a subset of $\{0, -, +\}^{E \setminus \{i\}}$. Then $\mathcal{M}' := (E \setminus \{i\}, \mathcal{L}', g)$ is an affine oriented matroid again. This is the *contraction* $\mathcal{M}/\{i\}$ of $\mathcal{M}$ to $E \setminus \{i\}$ (see [2, Lemma 4.1.8] for the definition of contraction in Covector Axioms). Clearly, the bounded complex $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}'}$ of $\mathcal{M}'$ can be identified with

$$\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}} \cap \mathcal{L}' = \{\lambda \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}} \mid \lambda(i) = 0\}.$$

Lemma 4.4. *If $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}} \not\subset \mathcal{L}'$ (that is, there is some $\lambda \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$ with $\lambda(i) \neq 0$), then we have* $\operatorname{rank} \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}'} < \operatorname{rank} \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$.

Proof. By Theorem 2.10, any maximal element $\mu \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$ satisfies $\mu(i) \neq 0$. Hence $\mu \notin \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}'}$, and the assertion follows. □

Set $\widetilde{S}' := \Bbbk[x_j, y_j \mid j \in [n] \setminus \{i\}] \subset \widetilde{S}$. Then $O_{\mathcal{M}'}$ is an ideal of $\widetilde{S}'$.

Lemma 4.5. *In the above situation, if $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$ is Cohen–Macaulay, then $\widetilde{S}'/O_{\mathcal{M}'}$ is also.*

Proof. Clearly, g is not a coloop also in $\mathcal{M}'$. So the results in the previous sections hold for $\widetilde{S}'/O_{\mathcal{M}'}$.

If $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}} \subset \mathcal{L}'$, then we have $O_{\mathcal{M}} = O_{\mathcal{M}'}\widetilde{S}$ and $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}} \cong (\widetilde{S}'/O_{\mathcal{M}'})[x_i, y_i]$. So the assertion is clear. Now we assume that $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}} \not\subset \mathcal{L}'$. Then we have $\operatorname{rank} \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}'} < \operatorname{rank} \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$ by Lemma 4.4.

Recall that $\widetilde{S}$ (resp. $\widetilde{S}'$) is a $\mathbb{Z}^{2n}$-graded (resp. $\mathbb{Z}^{2n-2}$-graded) ring. The inclusion $\widetilde{S}' \subset \widetilde{S}$ induces the injection $\mathbb{Z}^{2n-2} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{Z}^{2n}$, and we regard $\mathbb{Z}^{2n-2}$ as a subset of $\mathbb{Z}^{2n}$ in this way. For simplicity, we set $X^{(*)} := X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ and $Y^{(*)} := X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}'})$. Then we can regard $Y^{(*)}$ as a

subcomplex of $X^{(*)}$. Recall that we defined the order filter $X^{\geq \boldsymbol{a}} := \{\sigma \in X^{(*)} \mid \mathrm{gr}(\sigma) \geq \boldsymbol{a}\}$ of $X^{(*)}$ from $\boldsymbol{a} \in \mathbb{Z}^{2n}$.

For $\boldsymbol{b} \in \mathbb{Z}^{2n-2}$, the order filter $Y^{\geq \boldsymbol{b}}$ of $Y^{(*)}$ is defined in a similar way. Then we can regard $Y^{\geq \boldsymbol{b}} \subseteq X^{\geq \boldsymbol{b}}$ through the inclusion $\mathbb{Z}^{2n-2} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{Z}^{2n}$. Set $\boldsymbol{b} + i := \boldsymbol{b} + \deg(x_i) \in \mathbb{Z}^{2n}$ and $\boldsymbol{b} - i := \boldsymbol{b} + \deg(y_i) \in \mathbb{Z}^{2n}$. Then we have

$$X^{\geq \boldsymbol{b}} = X^{\geq \boldsymbol{b}+i} \sqcup X^{\geq \boldsymbol{b}-i} \sqcup Y^{\geq \boldsymbol{b}},$$

and it yields an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow C^\bullet(X^{\geq \boldsymbol{b}+i}) \oplus C^\bullet(X^{\geq \boldsymbol{b}-i}) \longrightarrow C^\bullet(X^{\geq \boldsymbol{b}}) \longrightarrow C^\bullet(Y^{\geq \boldsymbol{b}}) \longrightarrow 0 \tag{4.1}$$

of cochain complexes.

Since $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$ is Cohen–Macaulay, we have

$$H^j(C^\bullet(X^{\geq \boldsymbol{b}+i})) = H^j(C^\bullet(X^{\geq \boldsymbol{b}-i})) = H^j(C^\bullet(X^{\geq \boldsymbol{b}})) = 0$$

for all $j \neq \dim X = \operatorname{rank} \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$ by Proposition 3.3. From the sequence (4.1) and the present assumption that $\operatorname{rank} \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}'} < \operatorname{rank} \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$, we have $H^j(C^\bullet(Y^{\geq \boldsymbol{b}})) = 0$ for all $j \neq \operatorname{rank} B_{\mathcal{M}} - 1$. Let $\sigma \in Y^{(*)}$ be a maximal element, then $H^j(C^\bullet(Y^{\geq \sigma})) \neq 0$ for $j = \dim Y = \operatorname{rank} \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}'}$. Hence we have $\operatorname{rank} \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}'} = \operatorname{rank} \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}} - 1$, and the assertion follows from Proposition 3.3. □

For $A \subseteq [n]$, we set $S_A := \Bbbk[x_i \mid i \in A]$ and $\widetilde{S}_A := S_A \otimes_{\Bbbk} \Bbbk[y_i \mid i \in A]$.

Theorem 4.6. *If $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$ is Cohen–Macaulay, then $S/\overline{O_{\mathcal{M}}}$ is the Stanley-Reisner ring of a matroid.*

Proof. Since $\overline{O_{\mathcal{M}}}$ is a squarefree monomial ideal of S, there is a simplicial complex $\Delta \subset 2^{[n]}$ whose Stanley-Reisner ideal I_Δ coincides with $\overline{O_{\mathcal{M}}}$. Note that Δ is a matroid if and only if $\Delta|_F$ is Cohen–Macaulay for all $F \subset [n]$.

Set

$$\mathcal{L}(F \cup \{g\}) := \{\lambda|_{F\cup\{g\}} \mid \lambda \in \mathcal{L}, \operatorname{supp}(\lambda) \subseteq F \cup \{g\}\}.$$

By [2, Lemma 4.1.8], this is the set of covectors of the contraction $\mathcal{M}''$ of $\mathcal{M}$ to $F \cup \{g\}$ ($\mathcal{M}''$ is also an affine oriented matroid). It is easy to see that the Stanley-Reisner ring $S_F/I_{\Delta|_F}$ of $\Delta|_F$ coincides with

$$\widetilde{S}_F/O_{\mathcal{M}''} \otimes_{\widetilde{S}_F} \widetilde{S}_F/(x_i - y_i \mid i \in F).$$

Since $\{x_i - y_i \mid i \in F\}$ forms an $\widetilde{S}_F/O_{\mathcal{M}''}$-regular sequence by Corollary 4.3, it suffices to show that $\widetilde{S}_F/O_{\mathcal{M}''}$ is Cohen–Macaulay. However, we can prove this by the induction on $n - |F|$ using Lemma 4.5, which corresponds to the case $n - |F| = 1$. □

By Theorem 4.6, we see that the Cohen–Macaulayness of $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$ does not depend on the base filed $\Bbbk$.

As Example 2.15 shows, the converse of Theorem 2.13 does not hold in general. In the rest, we will prove that the converse is "essentially" true and also give a combinatorial characterization of Cohen–Macaulayness of $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$.

Before that, let us recall some properties of ordinary matroids for later use.

Lemma 4.7 (cf. [11, Cor. 1.2.6 and Exer. 4 in Sect. 2 of Chap. 1])**.** *Let $M := ([n], \Delta)$ be an ordinary matroid with the base set $\mathcal{F}(\Delta)$ and the circuit set $\mathcal{C}(M)$.*

(1) *For any base $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Delta)$ and $i \in [n] \setminus F$, there exists a unique circuit $C(i, F) \in \mathcal{C}(M)$ such that $C(i, F) \subseteq F \cup \{i\}$.*

(2) *For any circuit* $C \in \mathcal{C}(M)$ *and* $i \in C$*, there exists a base* $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Delta)$ *such that* $C = C(i, F)$.

Though the following property of circuits of ordinary matroids probably may be well-known for specialists in matroid theory, we will give a proof for completeness.

Corollary 4.8. *Let* $M = ([n], \Delta)$*,* $M' := ([n], \Delta')$ *be ordinary matroids and* $\mathcal{C}(M)$*,* $\mathcal{C}(M')$ *the sets of circuits of* M*,* M'*, respectively. If* $\operatorname{rank} M = \operatorname{rank} M'$ *and* $\mathcal{C}(M') \subseteq \mathcal{C}(M)$*, then* $M = M'$.

Proof. It suffices to show that $\mathcal{C}(M) \subseteq \mathcal{C}(M')$. Take any $C \in \mathcal{C}(M)$ and $i \in C$. By Lemma 4.7, there exists a base $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Delta)$ such that $C(i, F) = C$. It follows from the definition of $C(i, F)$ that $i \notin F$ and $C(i, F) \subseteq F \cup \{i\}$. Since $\#F < \#(F \cup \{i\})$ and $\operatorname{rank} M = \operatorname{rank} M'$, the set $F \cup \{i\}$ does not belong to Δ'. Hence there exists a circuit $C' \in \mathcal{C}(M')$ such that $C' \subseteq F \cup \{i\}$. Now $C' \in \mathcal{C}(M)$ since $\mathcal{C}(M') \subseteq \mathcal{C}(M)$. Consequently, it follows from the uniqueness of $C = C(i, F)$ that $C = C'$, and hence $C \in \mathcal{C}(M')$. □

Let $\mathcal{M} := ([n] \cup \{g\}, \mathcal{L}, g)$ be an affine oriented matroid with the cocircuit set $\mathcal{C}$. For simplicity, we say $\mathcal{M}$ is of *full rank* if for any $e \in [n] \cup \{g\}$ that is not a loop, there exists $\lambda \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$ with $e \in \operatorname{supp}(\lambda)$. This is equivalent to say that the rank of $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$ is equal to $\operatorname{rank} \mathcal{M} - 1$.

Recall that

$$\mathcal{C}|_{[n]} = \operatorname{Min} \left\{ \lambda|_{[n]} \mid \lambda \in \mathcal{C} \right\},$$

where Min denotes the set of inclusion-minimal elements. In the sequel, we set

$$\underline{(\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{L}^+)|_{[n]}} := \left\{ \operatorname{supp}(\lambda) \cap [n] \mid \lambda \in \mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{L}^+ \right\}.$$

Theorem 4.9. *Let* $\mathcal{M} := ([n] \cup \{g\}, \mathcal{L}, g)$ *be an affine oriented matroid of rank* r *with the cocircuit set* $\mathcal{C}$*, and let* $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$ *be the bounded complex of* $\mathcal{M}$*. Assume* g *is not a coloop and* $\mathcal{M}$ *is of full rank. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

(1) g *is in general position.*
(2) $\widetilde{S}/\overline{O_{\mathcal{M}}}$ *is Cohen–Macaulay.*
(3) $S/\overline{O_{\mathcal{M}}}$ *is Cohen–Macaulay.*
(4) $\underline{(\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{L}^+)|_{[n]}}$ *is the set of circuits of some ordinary matroid of rank* $n - r$.
(5) $\underline{(\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{L}^+)|_{[n]}} = \underline{\mathcal{C}|_{[n]}}$.
(6) $\overline{\mathcal{C}|_{[n]}} = \left\{ \lambda|_{[n]} \mid \lambda \in \mathcal{C},\ g \in \operatorname{supp}(\lambda) \right\}$.

If these are the cases, $\dim \widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}} = 2n - r$ *and* $\dim S/\overline{O_{\mathcal{M}}} = n - r$.

Proof. The implication (1) ⇒ (2) is just a part of Theorem 2.13. The equivalence (2) ⇔ (3) is the same as Corollary 4.3. The implications (2) ⇒ (4) and (6) ⇒ (1) follow from Theorems 4.6 and 2.12, respectively.

Let us prove (4) ⇒ (5). Since $\mathcal{M}$ is of rank r and g is not a coloop, the rank of $\mathcal{M}|_{[n]}$ is equal to r, which implies that the underlying matroid of $\mathcal{M}|_{[n]}$ is of rank r. It thus follows that $\underline{\mathcal{C}|_{[n]}}$ is the set of circuits of the dual matroid of $\underline{\mathcal{M}|_{[n]}}$ that is of rank $n-r$. Now $\underline{(\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{L}^+)|_{[n]}} \subseteq \underline{\mathcal{C}|_{[n]}}$ by Theorem 2.12. Therefore the desired equality follows from Corollary 4.8.

We will prove (5) ⇒ (6). Assume the assertion (5) holds. By Theorem 2.12, we have only to show that $\mathcal{C}|_{[n]} \subseteq \left\{ \lambda|_{[n]} \mid \lambda \in \mathcal{C},\ g \in \operatorname{supp}(\lambda) \right\}$. Take any $\mu \in \mathcal{C}$ with $\mu|_{[n]} \in \mathcal{C}|_{[n]}$. It suffices to prove $g \in \operatorname{supp}(\mu)$. By the assumption, there exists $\lambda \in \mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{L}^+$ such that

$\mathrm{supp}(\lambda|_{[n]}) = \mathrm{supp}(\mu|_{[n]})$. It then follows that $\mathrm{supp}(\mu) \subseteq \mathrm{supp}(\lambda)$, and hence $\mu = \lambda$ or $\mu = -\lambda$ by Circuit Axioms. Therefore $g \in \mathrm{supp}(\mu)$. □

Remark 4.10. Theorem 4.9 is generalized for affine oriented matroid $\mathcal{M} := ([n] \cup \{g\}, \mathcal{L}, g)$ that is not necessarily of full rank. Set

$$\overline{E} := \left\{ e \in [n] \cup \{g\} \mid {}^{\exists}\lambda \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}} \text{ s.t. } \lambda(e) \neq 0 \right\}$$

and $\overline{E}' := \overline{E} \setminus \{g\}$. It then follows that

$$\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}} \cong \widetilde{S}_{\overline{E}'}/O_{\mathcal{M}|_{\overline{E}}} \otimes_{\Bbbk} \Bbbk[x_i, y_i \mid i \in \overline{E} \setminus E] \tag{4.2}$$

and the theorem still holds true if we replace

- the first condition by "g is in general position in $\mathcal{M}|_{\overline{E}}$",
- each "$|_{[n]}$" by "$|_{\overline{E}'}$", and
- "$n - r$" in the fourth condition by "$\#\overline{E}' - \mathrm{rank}(\mathcal{M}|_{\overline{E}})$)".

Example 4.11. Let $\mathcal{M} = ([n] \cup \{g\}, \mathcal{L}, g)$ be a uniform affine oriented matroid of rank r, that is an affine oriented matroid the underlying matroid of which consists of all the subsets of $[n] \cup \{g\}$ of cardinality r. It then follows that

$$\underline{\mathcal{C}} = \{F \subseteq [n] \cup \{g\} \mid \#F = n + 2 - r\},$$

and hence $\mathcal{M}$ is of full rank. Moreover

$$\overline{O_{\mathcal{M}}} = \left(x_{F \setminus \{g\}} \mid F \in \underline{\mathcal{C}},\ g \in F\right) = \left(x_F \mid F \subseteq [n],\ \#F = n + 1 - r\right).$$

Thus $\overline{O_{\mathcal{M}}}$ is just the Stanley–Reisner ideal of the uniform matroid on $[n]$ of rank $n-r$. Hence $S/\overline{O_{\mathcal{M}}}$ is Cohen–Macaulay of dimension $n - r$. Clearly

$$\underline{(\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{L}^+)|_{[n]}} = \{F \subseteq [n] \mid \#F = n + 1 - r\} = \underline{\mathcal{C}|_{[n]}}$$

and as is shown above, this is just the set of circuits of the uniform matroid of rank $n - r$.

Remark 4.12. For positive integers n, l with $n \geq l$, let $I_{n,l} \subset S = \Bbbk[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ be the ideal

$$(x_F \mid F \subset [n], \#F = l).$$

As we have seen in the above example, $I_{n,l}$ is given by the specialization of the ideal $O_{\mathcal{M}} \subset \widetilde{S}$ associated with a uniform oriented matroid $\mathcal{M}$. Hence a minimal S-free resolution of $S/I_{n,l}$ is supported by the bounded complex $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$ of $\mathcal{M}$, whose underlying space is homeomorphic to a ball as shown by Dong [4]. For example, a minimal free resolution of $I_{4,2}$ is supported by the shaded part of Figure 1. Since $I_{n,l}$ is a Cohen–Macaulay squarefree strongly stable monomial ideal, that the free resolution is supported by a ball also follows from [13, Corollary 6.1]. We have no idea on the relation between these two constructions.

5. Canonical module of $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$ and the topology of $X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$

Let $\mathcal{M} = (E, \mathcal{L}, g)$ with $E = [n] \cup \{g\}$ be an affine oriented matroid as above. The restriction $\mathcal{M}|_{\overline{E}}$ to

$$\overline{E} := \{\, i \in E \mid \lambda(i) \neq 0 \text{ for some } \lambda \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}\}$$

does not change the combinatorial structure of $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$ and the ring theoretic properties of the ideal $O_{\mathcal{M}}$ so much. In fact, if we set $\widetilde{S}' := \Bbbk[x_i, y_i \mid i \in \overline{E} \setminus \{g\}]$, then $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$ is a cone over $\widetilde{S}'/O_{\mathcal{M}|_{\overline{E}}}$ as shown in (4.2). For a simple exposition, in the rest of the paper, we assume that

$E = \overline{E}$ holds (hence $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$ is of full rank), while the theorems remain true in the general case. We leave the arguments for the general case to the reader as easy exercises.

Since we assume that $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$ is of full rank, a maximal element of $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$ is also maximal in $\mathcal{L}$. According to Chapter 4 of [2], we call a maximal element of $\mathcal{L}$ (resp. $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$) a *tope* of $\mathcal{L}$ (resp. $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$). If $\lambda \in \mathcal{L}$ is covered by a tope, we call λ a *subtope*. Any subtope of $\mathcal{L}$ is contained in exactly two topes of $\mathcal{L}$.

Recall that $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$ gives a regular CW complex $X^{(*)} := X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$. We can define the boundary $\partial X^{(*)}$ of $X^{(*)}$ in the natural way, and we identify $\partial X^{(*)}$ with the corresponding subset of $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$ by abuse of notation. Here $\lambda \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$ (more precisely, the corresponding cell in $X^{(*)}$) belongs to $\partial X^{(*)}$ if and only if there is some $\mu \in \mathcal{L} \setminus \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$ with $\mu > \lambda$. Clearly, $\partial X^{(*)}$ is also a regular CW complex, and its underlying space is a closed subset of that of $X^{(*)}$. Any subtope of $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$ is contained in at most two topes of $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$. A subtope of $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$ belongs to the boundary if and only if it is contained in a sole tope of $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$.

Next, under the assumption that $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$ is Cohen–Macaulay, we will give an explicit description of the canonical module $\omega_{\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}}$ of $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$. For $\lambda \in \mathcal{L}$, set

$$\mathsf{n}_\lambda := \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{n} x_i y_i}{\mathsf{m}_\lambda} \in \widetilde{S}.$$

Theorem 5.1. *If $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$ is Cohen–Macaulay, its canonical module $\omega_{\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}}$ is isomorphic to the ideal*

$$J_{\mathcal{M}} := (\mathsf{n}_\lambda \mid \lambda \text{ is a tope of } \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$$

of $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$.

To prove the theorem, we need the following lemmas.

Lemma 5.2. *Assume that $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$ is Cohen–Macaulay. Then we have the following.*

1. *$\mathsf{n}_\mu \in O_{\mathcal{M}}$ for any $\mu \in \mathcal{L}^+ \setminus \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$.*
2. *If $\lambda \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$ corresponds to a cell in the boundary $\partial X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$, we have $\mathsf{n}_\lambda \in O_{\mathcal{M}}$.*

Proof. (1) Take any $\mu \in \mathcal{L}^+ \setminus \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$. By the definition of $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$, we have a cocircuit $\nu \in \mathcal{C}$ with $\nu(g) = 0$ and $\mu > \nu$. By Theorem 4.9, g is in general position, since $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$ is Cohen–Macaulay (we assume that $\mathcal{M}$ is of full rank in this section). It thus follows from Theorem 2.12 that $\nu|_{[n]} = \nu_1 \circ \nu_2$ for some $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in \mathcal{C}|_{[n]}$ with $S(\nu_1, \nu_2) = \varnothing$ and $\operatorname{sgn}(\nu_1) = -\operatorname{sgn}(\nu_2) \neq 0$, where $\operatorname{sgn} : \mathcal{C}|_{[n]} \to \{0, -, +\}$ is the localization of $\mathcal{M}$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\operatorname{sgn}(\nu_1) = -$ (recall that $S(\nu_1, \nu_2) = \varnothing$ implies $\nu_1 \circ \nu_2 = \nu_2 \circ \nu_1$). By Theorem 2.12 again, we obtain the cocircuit $\widetilde{\nu}_1 \in \mathcal{C}$ such that

$$\widetilde{\nu}_1(i) = \begin{cases} \nu_1(i) & \text{if } i \in [n], \\ - & \text{if } i = g. \end{cases}$$

Clearly $-\widetilde{\nu}_1 \in \mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{L}^+ \subset \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$, and hence $\mathsf{m}_{-\widetilde{\nu}_1} \in O_{\mathcal{M}}$. Now $\mu|_{[n]} \geq \nu|_{[n]} \geq \nu_1$, or equivalently $\mu(i) = \widetilde{\nu}_1(i)$ for all $i \in \operatorname{supp}(\widetilde{\nu}_1) \setminus \{g\}$. Therefore it follows that $\mathsf{m}_{-\widetilde{\nu}_1}$ divides n_μ.

(2) Since λ is in the boundary of $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$, there exists $\mu \in \mathcal{L}^+ \setminus \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$ with $\mu > \lambda$, or equivalently $\mathsf{n}_\mu \mid \mathsf{n}_\lambda$. So the assertion directly follows from (1). □

Recall that $X^{(*)} = X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ supports a minimal $\mathbb{Z}^{2n}$-graded $\widetilde{S}$-free resolution $\mathcal{F}^X_\bullet$ of $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$. Let $\omega_{\widetilde{S}} := \widetilde{S}(-\mathbf{1})$ with $\mathbf{1} = (1, \ldots, 1) \in \mathbb{Z}^{2n}$ be the $\mathbb{Z}^{2n}$-graded canonical module of $\widetilde{S}$. If

$\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$ is Cohen–Macaulay, then

$$H^i(\mathrm{Hom}^{\bullet}_{\widetilde{S}}(\mathcal{F}^X_{\bullet}, \omega_{\widetilde{S}})) \cong \begin{cases} \omega_{\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}} & \text{if } i = \dim X + 1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Hence $\mathrm{Hom}^{\bullet}_{\widetilde{S}}(\mathcal{F}^X_{\bullet}, \omega_{\widetilde{S}})$ gives a minimal $\mathbb{Z}^{2n}$-graded $\widetilde{S}$-free resolution of $\omega_{\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}}$ up to shift. We also remark that

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\widetilde{S}}(\widetilde{S}(-\deg(\mathsf{m}_\lambda)), \omega_{\widetilde{S}}) \cong \widetilde{S}(-\deg(\mathsf{n}_\lambda))$$

for each $\lambda \in \mathcal{L}$. As in the proof of Theorem 3.6, if $\lambda \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$ corresponds to $\sigma \in X^{(*)}$, we have

$$H^d(C^{\bullet}(X^{\geq \sigma})) \cong [\omega_{\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}}]_{\deg(\mathsf{n}_\lambda)}, \tag{5.1}$$

where $d := \dim X$, and $C^{\bullet}(X^{\geq \sigma})$ is the cochain complex defined in §3. The minimal presentation of $\omega_{\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}}$ is of the form

$$\bigoplus_{\mu\text{: subtope of } \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}} \widetilde{S}(-\deg(\mathsf{n}_\mu)) \xrightarrow{\psi} \bigoplus_{\lambda\text{: tope of } \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}} \widetilde{S}(-\deg(\mathsf{n}_\lambda)) \longrightarrow \omega_{\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}} \longrightarrow 0. \tag{5.2}$$

Here ψ sends the basis element e_μ of a free summand $\widetilde{S}(-\deg(\mathsf{n}_\mu))$ to

$$\sum_{\lambda\text{: tope of } \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}} [\lambda : \mu] \cdot (\mathsf{n}_\mu/\mathsf{n}_\lambda)\, e_\lambda \in \bigoplus_{\lambda\text{: tope of } \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}} \widetilde{S}(-\deg(\mathsf{n}_\lambda)).$$

Note that, in this situation, $[\lambda : \mu] \neq 0$, if and only if $\mu < \lambda$, if and only if n_λ divides n_μ.

In the following result, the assumption that $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$ is Cohen–Macaulay is superfluous, while we do not omit it here for simple exposition.

Lemma 5.3. *Assume that $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$ is Cohen–Macaulay. Let $\Delta_{\mathcal{M}} \subset 2^{[2n]}$ be the simplicial complex whose Stanley-Reisner ring is $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$. For a squarefree monomial $\mathsf{m} \in \widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$ whose support corresponds to a facet of $\Delta_{\mathcal{M}}$, we have $\mathsf{m} \in J_{\mathcal{M}}$. Here $J_{\mathcal{M}}$ is the ideal of $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$ defined in Theorem 5.1.*

Proof. Set $d' := \dim \widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}} = \dim \Delta_{\mathcal{M}} + 1$, and let $\mathfrak{m}$ be the graded maximal ideal of $\widetilde{S}$. For $\boldsymbol{a} \in \mathbb{N}^{2n}$, we have $\dim_{\Bbbk}[\omega_{\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}}]_{\boldsymbol{a}} = \dim_{\Bbbk}[H^{d'}_{\mathfrak{m}}(\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}})]_{-\boldsymbol{a}}$ by the local duality theorem, and the right side can be computed by Hochster's formula (c.f. [1, Theorem 5.3.8]). If $\boldsymbol{a} = \deg(\mathsf{m})$ (that is, the support of $\boldsymbol{a}$ is a facet of $\Delta_{\mathcal{M}}$), then $\dim_{\Bbbk}[H^{d'}_{\mathfrak{m}}(\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}})]_{-\boldsymbol{a}} = 1$ and hence $[\omega_{\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}}]_{\deg(\mathsf{m})} \neq 0$. Since any minimal homogeneous generator of $\omega_{\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}}$ has the same degree as n_λ for some tope $\lambda \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$ by (5.2), m can be divided by n_λ for some tope $\lambda \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$. Since $\mathsf{n}_\lambda \in J_{\mathcal{M}}$, we are done. □

Proof of Theorem 5.1. Recall that $\mathcal{L}$ gives a regular CW complex whose underlying space is homeomorphic to a d-sphere. Hence $\widehat{\mathcal{L}} := \mathcal{L} \cup \{\hat{1}\}$ gives a regular CW complex $X(\widehat{\mathcal{L}})$ whose underlying space is homeomorphic to a $(d+1)$-ball. By abuse of notation, $\hat{1}$ also denotes the maximum cell of $X(\widehat{\mathcal{L}})$. Clearly, $X^{(*)} := X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ is a subcomplex of $X(\widehat{\mathcal{L}})$. In the sequel, as an incidence function of $X^{(*)}$, we use the restriction of an incidence function of $X(\widehat{\mathcal{L}})$. If a subtope $\mu \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$ corresponds to a cell in $X^{(*)} \setminus \partial X^{(*)}$, then there are exactly two topes λ_1 and λ_2 of $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$ which cover μ, and we have

$$[\hat{1} : \lambda_1] \cdot [\lambda_1 : \mu] + [\hat{1} : \lambda_2] \cdot [\lambda_2 : \mu] = 0 \tag{5.3}$$

by a basic property of an incidence function.

Define a $\mathbb{Z}^{2n}$-graded $\widetilde{S}$-morphism

$$\phi : \bigoplus_{\lambda\text{: tope of } \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}} \widetilde{S}(-\deg(\mathsf{n}_\lambda)) \longrightarrow J_{\mathcal{M}}$$

by $e_\lambda \longmapsto [\hat{1} : \lambda] \cdot \mathsf{n}_\lambda \in J_{\mathcal{M}}$, where e_λ is a free basis corresponding to a direct summand $\widetilde{S}(-\deg(\mathsf{n}_\lambda))$. Clearly, ϕ is surjective. For the map ψ appearing in the minimal presentation (5.2) of $\omega_{\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}}$, we will show that $\phi \circ \psi = 0$. To do this, it suffices to show that $\phi \circ \psi(e_\mu) = 0$ for all subtope μ of $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$.

Let $\lambda \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$ be a tope, and $\mu \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$ a subtope with $\mu < \lambda$. Clearly, n_λ divides n_μ. If μ corresponds to a cell in $\partial X^{(*)}$, then $(\mathsf{n}_\mu/\mathsf{n}_\lambda) \cdot \mathsf{n}_\lambda = \mathsf{n}_\mu \in O_{\mathcal{M}}$ by Lemma 5.2 (2). Hence $[J_{\mathcal{M}}]_{\deg(\mathsf{n}_\mu)} = 0$, and we have $\phi \circ \psi(e_\mu) = 0$. Next we consider the case μ does not belong to $\partial X^{(*)}$. In this case, μ is contained in exactly two topes of $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$, say λ_1 and λ_2. Then $\phi \circ \psi$ sends $e_\mu \in \widetilde{S}(-\deg(\mathsf{n}_\mu))$ to

$$([\hat{1} : \lambda_1] \cdot [\lambda_1 : \mu] + [\hat{1} : \lambda_2] \cdot [\lambda_2 : \mu]) \cdot \mathsf{n}_\mu,$$

but this is 0 by (5.3). Now we have $\phi \circ \psi = 0$. Hence we have a $\mathbb{Z}^{2n}$-graded $\widetilde{S}$-homomorphism

$$f : \omega_{\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}} (\cong \operatorname{coker}(\psi)) \longrightarrow J_{\mathcal{M}}$$

by the universal property of the cokernel. Since ϕ is surjective, f is also. So it suffices to show that it is injective.

For the contradiction, assume that $\ker(f) \neq 0$. Then

$$\dim(\ker(f)) = \dim \omega_{\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}} = \dim \Delta_{\mathcal{M}} + 1,$$

where $\Delta_{\mathcal{M}}$ is the simplicial complex defined in Lemma 5.3. Since $\ker(f)$ is a *squarefree module* over $\widetilde{S}$ (see [17] for the definition and basic properties), there is a facet $F \in \Delta_{\mathcal{M}}$ with $[\ker(f)]_F \neq 0$. Here we identify $F \subset [2n]$ with the corresponding squarefree vector in $\mathbb{Z}^{2n}$. On the other hand, we have $[J_{\mathcal{M}}]_F \neq 0$ for all facet $F \in \Delta_{\mathcal{M}}$ by Lemma 5.3. Similarly, we have shown that $\dim_{\Bbbk}[\omega_{\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}}]_F = 1$ for all facet $F \in \Delta_{\mathcal{M}}$ in the proof of Lemma 5.3. Hence we have $\dim_{\Bbbk}[\ker(f)]_F = 0$ for all facet F, and this is a contradiction. □

6. $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$ is Cohen–Macaulay implies $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$ is a homology manifold

In this section, under the assumption that $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$ is Cohen–Macaulay, we will prove that $X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ and its boundary $\partial X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ are homology manifolds over $\mathbb{Z}$. Moreover, the same is true for (the geometric realization of) the simplicial complex $\Delta_{\mathcal{M}}$ whose Stanley-Reisner ring coincides with $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$, while the dimensions of $X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ and $\Delta_{\mathcal{M}}$ are different. To obtain these results, the description of $\omega_{\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}}$ given in the previous section plays a role.

Let us first recall the definition of homology manifolds. There are several slightly different definitions (cf. [6, 7, 14]). Here we eclectically adopt the definition from [6] and [7]. There is no problem in doing so since in this paper we deal with only finite regular CW complexes that are locally contractible compact Hausdorff and of finite cohomological dimension over any abelian group G in the sense of [6] (moreover Borel–Moore homology coincides with singular homology).

A finite regular CW complex X is said to be a *homology n-manifold* over an abelian group G if

$$H_i(X, X \setminus \{x\}; G) \cong \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } i \neq n, \\ 0 \text{ or } G & \text{for } i = n. \end{cases}$$

If this is the case, the subset

$$\{x \in X \mid H_n(X, X \setminus \{x\}; G) \cong 0\} \tag{6.1}$$

is called the boundary of X.

The next lemma is probably well-known for specialists, but let us introduce for completeness. The proof is an easy exercise using the universal coefficient theorem and the structure theorem of finitely generated abelian groups.

Lemma 6.1. *Let (X, A) be a topological pair and n an integer. Assume $H_i(X, A; \mathbb{Z})$ is finitely generated for all i. Then the following are equivalent.*

(1) *$H_i(X, A; \mathbb{Z}) = 0$ for all $i < n$.*
(2) *$H_i(X, A; \Bbbk) = 0$ for all $i < n$ and any field $\Bbbk$.*

If these are the cases, then $H_n(X, A; \mathbb{Z}) \cong \mathbb{Z}$ if and only if $\dim_{\Bbbk} H_n(X, A; \Bbbk) = 1$ for any field $\Bbbk$.

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be an oriented matroid with the bounded complex $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$. The following lemma in conjunction with Proposition 3.4 implies that $X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ is a homology manifold over $\Bbbk$ when $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$ is Cohen–Macaulay.

Lemma 6.2. *Assume that $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$ is Cohen–Macaulay. For a cell $\sigma \in X^{(*)} := X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$, we have*

$$H^i(C^\bullet(X^{\geq \sigma})) \cong \begin{cases} \Bbbk & \text{if } i = \dim X \text{ and } \sigma \notin \partial X^{(*)}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. Since $X^{(*)}$ is Cohen–Macaulay by Theorem 3.6, $H^i(C^\bullet(X^{\geq \sigma})) = 0$ for all $i < d := \dim X$ by Lemma 3.5. So it suffices to consider $H^d(C^\bullet(X^{\geq \sigma}))$. First, assume that $\sigma \notin \partial X^{(*)}$. Recall that the covector set $\mathcal{L}$ $(\supset \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ is also a CW poset, and gives a regular CW complex $Y^{(*)}$ whose underlying space is homeomorphic to a sphere (Theorem 2.7). Note that $X^{(*)}$ is a subcomplex of $Y^{(*)}$ with $\dim Y^{(*)} = \dim X^{(*)} (= d)$. Since $\sigma \in X^{(*)} \setminus \partial X^{(*)}$, we have $X^{\geq \sigma} = Y^{\geq \sigma}$. Since $Y^{(*)}$ is a d-sphere, we have

$$H^d(C^\bullet(X^{\geq \sigma})) \cong H^d(C^\bullet(Y^{\geq \sigma})) \cong \Bbbk.$$

The second isomorphism follows from Proposition 3.4.

Next, assume that $\sigma \in \partial X^{(*)}$. Let $\lambda \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$ be the covector corresponding to σ. Then $[\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}]_{\deg(\mathsf{n}_\lambda)} = 0$ by Lemma 5.2 (2), so we have $[\omega_{\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}}]_{\deg(\mathsf{n}_\lambda)} = 0$. Hence the assertion follows from (5.1). □

As an immediate consequence, the following result can be deduced.

Corollary 6.3. *Assume $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$ is Cohen–Macaulay (for some field $\Bbbk$), then $X := X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ is a homology manifold with boundary over $\mathbb{Z}$. Moreover the boundary defined by* (6.1) *coincides with the natural one.*

Proof. As is stated below Theorem 4.6, the Cohen–Macaulayness of $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$ does not depend on the base field $\Bbbk$. Hence it follows from Proposition 3.4 and Lemmas 6.1, 6.2 that X is a homology $(\dim X)$-manifold with boundary

$$\bigcup_{\sigma \in \partial X^{(*)}} \sigma = \{x \in X \mid H_n(X, X \setminus \{x\}; \Bbbk) \cong 0\}$$

over $\mathbb{Z}$. □

In the case where $\operatorname{rank} \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}} = 2$, the Cohen–Macaulayness of $X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$, hence that of $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$ (Corollary 3.7) implies $X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ to be homeomorphic to a closed ball. To prove this assertion, we need the following facts in PL (piecewise linear) topology, which is used in Dong's proof of his main theorem in [4]. Refer to [2, 4] and references there for unexplained terminologies and proofs.

Lemma 6.4 (cf. op. cit.)**.** *Let Δ be a simplicial complex.*

(1) *Assume Δ is shellable. Then Δ is a PL sphere or a PL ball if each face of codimension one is contained in at most two facets. It is indeed a PL sphere if each face of codimension one is contained in exactly two facets.*
(2) *Δ is a PL manifold if and only if for each vertex v of Δ, the link of v is a PL sphere or a PL ball of codimension one.*
(3) *Δ is a PL ball if it is a PL manifold and PL collapsible.*
(4) *A (external) join of two PL spheres is a PL sphere.*
(5) *A (external) join of a PL sphere and a PL ball is a PL ball.*
(6) *If Δ is a PL sphere, then the link of each face of Δ is also a PL sphere.*

Remark 6.5. A simplicial complex Δ is a ball (resp. sphere or manifold) if it is a PL ball (resp. PL sphere or PL manifold); it is a well-known fact in PL topology that the converse is not true in general.

For $\lambda \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$, we set

$$\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}^{>\lambda} := \{\mu \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}} \mid \mu > \lambda\}.$$

Similarly $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}^{<\lambda}$ is defined. As is proved by Dong [4, Corollary 3.4], (the geometric realization of) the order complex $\Delta(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ of $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$ is always PL collapsible. Hence $\Delta(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ is a PL ball if and only if $\Delta(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ is a PL manifold. Since $\Delta(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ is always pure as is proved in [3, Corollary 3.3], the link of each vertex $v \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$ is of codimension one. The complex $\Delta(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ is thus a PL manifold if and only if the link of each vertex in the order complex $\Delta(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ is either a PL ball or a PL sphere. Moreover it coincides with the (external) join $\Delta(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}^{<\lambda}) * \Delta(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}^{>\lambda})$. The first complex $\Delta(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}^{<\lambda})$ is empty or otherwise a PL sphere, since it is just a link of some face in $\Delta(\mathcal{L})$ which is a PL sphere by Propositions 2.4, 6.4, and Theorem 2.7. As a consequence, $\Delta(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ is a PL manifold if $\Delta(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}^{>\lambda})$ is empty or otherwise either a PL sphere or a PL ball for any $\lambda \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$.

Proposition 6.6. *Assume* $\operatorname{rank} \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}} = 2$. *Then $X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ is homeomorphic to a closed ball if and only if it is Cohen–Macaulay over a field $\Bbbk$ as a topological space.*

Proof. We have only to show "if" part. Since $X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ is homeomorphic to $\Delta(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$, we may replace $X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ by $\Delta(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$. It thus suffices to show that $\Delta(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ is a PL ball. Assume $\Delta(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ is Cohen–Macaulay over a field $\Bbbk$. Let $\lambda \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$ and assume $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}^{>\lambda} \neq \varnothing$. By Proposition 6.4 and the arguments above, we have only to show that $\Delta(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}^{>\lambda})$ is shellable and each face of codimension one is a face of at most two facets.

Since $\Delta(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}^{>\lambda})$ is the link of some face of $\Delta(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$, it is also Cohen–Macaulay and moreover its dimension is less than or equal to one. Therefore $\Delta(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}^{>\lambda})$ is shellable; for a simplicial complex is shellable if it is of dimension zero or Cohen–Macaulay of dimension one. The condition on faces of codimension one immediately follows from Proposition 2.4. □

Example 6.7. (1) Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a uniform affine oriented matroid. As is shown in Example 4.11, $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$ is Cohen–Macaulay and hence the bounded complex $X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ is also Cohen–Macaulay (over any field $\Bbbk$) by Corollary 3.7. In the case where $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$ is of rank 2, our Proposition 6.6 thus induces Dong's theorem ([4]) on the bounded complex of uniform matroids, saying $X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ is homeomorphic to a ball.

(2) Any affine hyperplane (hence line) arrangement $\mathcal{H} = \{H_1, \ldots, H_n\}$ in $\mathbb{R}^2$ with $\bigcap H_i = \varnothing$ induces an affine oriented matroid $\mathcal{M}$, as is stated in Remark 2.14. If the decomposition of $\mathbb{R}^2$ by $\mathcal{H}$ has a bounded region of dimension 2, then the bounded complex $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$ is of rank 2. In particular, it is homeomorphic to a closed ball if and only if $X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ is Cohen–Macaulay over a field $\Bbbk$.

For example, the bounded complexes presented in Figures 1, 2, 4, and 8 are such ones. Those in Figures 1, 2, and 8 are all balls (hence they are necessarily Cohen–Macaulay). On the other hand the bounded complex in Figure 4 is not; this complex is a typical example of a non-Cohen–Macaulay simplicial complex.

Remark 6.8. Let $\mathcal{H} := \{H_1, \ldots, H_n\}$ be an affine hyperplane arrangement in $\mathbb{R}^d$ with $\bigcap H_i = \varnothing$. Assume there exists $H_{i_1}, \ldots, H_{i_s}$ that intersect with a point, and the bounded complex $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}}$ of the oriented matroid $\mathcal{M}$ induced from $\mathcal{H}$ is of full rank. Then $X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ is homeomorphic to the barycentric subdivision Δ of the polyhedral complex consisting of the polytopes given by some of $H_1, \ldots, H_n$. Moreover the dimension of Δ is equal to $\operatorname{rank} \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}} = d$. The (geometric) simplicial complex Δ is thus identically PL embedded in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Now assume $X(\mathcal{B})$, hence Δ, is Cohen–Macaulay. Applying the results by Miller and Reiner [9], we can deduce that $X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ is a ball whenever $d \leq 3$ and a topological manifold when $d \leq 4$.

Next we will study the boundary $\partial X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ of the homology manifold $X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$. Applying the result due to W. J. R. Mitchell [6], we can show that $\partial X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ is a homology manifold without boundary over $\mathbb{Z}$ if $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$ is Cohen–Macaulay. Mitchell's theorem can be applied to more general homology manifolds of first countable. For a finite regular CW complex, the theorem reads as follows.

Theorem 6.9 (Mitchell [6])**.** *Let X be a finite regular CW complex. Assume X is a homology n-manifold over $\mathbb{Z}$ with boundary. Then its boundary ∂X is empty or a homology manifold without boundary.*

Corollary 6.10. *If $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$ is Cohen–Macaulay, then the boundary ∂X of $X := X(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{M}})$ is a homology manifold without boundary over $\mathbb{Z}$.*

In the situation of Corollary 6.10, we strongly believe that ∂X is a *homology sphere* over $\mathbb{Z}$, that is,

$$H_i(\partial X, \partial X \setminus \{x\}; \mathbb{Z}) = H_i(\partial X; \mathbb{Z}) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{Z} & \text{if } i = \dim \partial X, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{6.2}$$

for all $x \in \partial X$. However, we have no proof yet.

On the other hand, we have the following. If a finite simplicial complex Δ (more precisely, its geometric realization $|\Delta|$) is a homology manifold with boundary, there is a subcomplex $\partial\Delta$ of Δ such that $|\partial\Delta|$ is the boundary of $|\Delta|$ in the sense of [6].

Theorem 6.11. *Assume that $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$ is Cohen–Macaulay. For the simplicial complex $\Delta_{\mathcal{M}} \subset 2^{[2n]}$ whose Stanley-Reisner ring is $\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$, $\Delta_{\mathcal{M}}$ is a homology manifold over $\mathbb{Z}$ with boundary. Moreover, the boundary is a homology sphere in the sense of* (6.2).

Proof. Set $d := \dim \Delta_{\mathcal{M}}$. For the first assertion, it suffices to show that $\Delta_{\mathcal{M}}$ is a homology manifold over $\Bbbk$ by the same reason as the proof of Corollary 6.3. Moreover, since $\Delta_{\mathcal{M}}$ is Cohen–Macaulay, it suffices to show that $\dim_{\Bbbk} H^{d-\#F}(\mathrm{lk}_{\Delta_{\mathcal{M}}} F; \Bbbk) \leq 1$ for all $\emptyset \neq F \in \Delta_{\mathcal{M}}$. However, identifying $F \in \Delta_{\mathcal{M}}$ with the corresponding squarefree vector in $\mathbb{Z}^{2n}$, we have

$$\dim_{\Bbbk} H^{d-\#F}(\mathrm{lk}_{\Delta_{\mathcal{M}}} F; \Bbbk) = \dim_{\Bbbk}[\omega_{\widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}}]_F = \dim_{\Bbbk}[J_{\mathcal{M}}]_F \leq 1.$$

Here the first (resp. second) equality follows from Hochster's formula (resp. Theorem 5.1).

For the second assertion, note that $F \in \Delta_{\mathcal{M}}$ belongs to the boundary $\partial\Delta_{\mathcal{M}}$, if and only if $H^{d-\#F}(\mathrm{lk}_{\Delta_{\mathcal{M}}} F; \Bbbk) = 0$, if and only if $\mathsf{m}_F \notin J_{\mathcal{M}}$, where $\mathsf{m}_F \in \widetilde{S}$ is the squarefree monomial corresponding to F (recall that $H^{d-\#F}(\mathrm{lk}_{\Delta_{\mathcal{M}}} F; \Bbbk) \cong [J_{\mathcal{M}}]_F$). Hence the Stanley-Reisner ring $\Bbbk[\partial\Delta_{\mathcal{M}}]$ of $\partial\Delta_{\mathcal{M}}$ is isomorphic to $\Bbbk[\Delta_{\mathcal{M}}]/J_{\mathcal{M}}$ (note that $\Bbbk[\Delta_{\mathcal{M}}] = \widetilde{S}/O_{\mathcal{M}}$). Since $\Bbbk[\Delta_{\mathcal{M}}]$ is Cohen–Macaulay and $J_{\mathcal{M}}$ is its canonical ideal in the graded context, $\Bbbk[\partial\Delta_{\mathcal{M}}]$ is a Gorenstein ring with $\Bbbk[\partial\Delta_{\mathcal{M}}] \cong \omega_{\Bbbk[\partial\Delta_{\mathcal{M}}]}$ as graded modules by the graded version of [1, Proposition 3.3.18], and it means that $\partial\Delta_{\mathcal{M}}$ is a homology sphere over $\Bbbk$. Since $\Bbbk$ is arbitrary, we get the statement over $\mathbb{Z}$ by Lemma 6.1. □

However, in the situation of Theorem 6.11, we have no idea whether the geometric realization $|\Delta_{\mathcal{M}}|$ is homeomorphic to a ball, or even whether it is contractible.

Acknowledgments

The authors are very grateful to Satoshi Murai for stimulating discussion and bringing the paper [6] to our attention.

References

[1] W. Bruns and J. Herzog, *Cohen–Macaulay rings*, rev. ed., Cambridge Stud. Adv. Math. **39**, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1998 (DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511608681)

[2] A. Björner, M. Las Vergnas, B. Sturmfels, N. White, and G. Ziegler, *Oriented Matroids*, 2nd ed., Encyclopedia Math. Appl. **46**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999 (DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511586507)

[3] X. Dong, *On the bounded complex of an affine oriented matroid*, Discrete Comput. Geom. **35** (2006), 457–471 (DOI: 10.1007/s00454-005-1204-0)

[4] X. Dong, The bounded complex of a uniform affine oriented matroid is a ball, J Combin. Theory Ser. A **115** (2008), 651–661 (DOI: 10.1016/j.jcta.2007.07.009)

[5] N. Epstein and H. D. Nguyen, *Algebra retracts and Stanley–Reisner rings*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **218** (2014), 1665–1682 (DOI:10.1016/j.jpaa.2014.01.006)

[6] W. J. R. Mitchell, *Defining the boundary of a homology manifold*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **110** (1990), pp. 509–513 (DOI: 10.1090/S0002-9939-1990-1019276-9)

[7] J. R. Munkres, *Elements of Algebraic Topology*, Addison-Wesley, 1984.

[8] E. Miller, B.Sturmfels, and K. Yanagawa, *Generic and cogeneric monomial ideals*, J. Symb. Comput. **29** (2000), 691–708 (DOI: 10.1006/jsco.1999.0290).

[9] E. Miller and V. Reiner, *Reciprocal domains and Cohen–Macaulay d-complexes in* $\mathbb{R}^d$, Electron. J. Combin. **11** (2004), 9 pages.

[10] I. Novik, A. Postnikov, and B. Sturmfels, *Syzygies of oriented matroids*, Duke Math. J. **111** (2002), 287–317 (DOI: 10.1215/S0012-7094-02-11124-7).

[11] J. Oxley, *Matroid Theory*, 2nd ed., Oxford Grad. Texts Math. **21**, Oxford Univ. Press, New York, 2011 (DOI: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198566946.001.0001)

[12] R. Okazaki and K. Yanagawa, *Alternative polarizations of Borel fixed ideals, Eliahou–Kervaire type resolution and discrete Morse theory*, J. Algebr. Comb. (2013), pp. 407–436 (DOI: 10.1007/s10801-012-0409-6)
[13] R. Okazaki and K. Yanagawa, *On CW complexes supporting Eliahou–Kervaire type resolutions of Borel fixed ideals*, Collect. Math. **66** (2015), 125-147 (DOI: 10.1007/s13348-014-0104-0)
[14] E. H. Spanier, *Algebraic Topology*, McGraw-Hill, 1966.
[15] R. P. Stanley, *Combinatorics and Commutative Algebra*, 2nd ed., Progr. Math. **41**, Birkhäuser, Basel, 1996 (DOI: 10.1007/b139094)
[16] D. J. A. Welsh, *Matroid Theory*, Academic Press, 1976.
[17] K. Yanagawa, *Alexander duality for Stanley–Reisner rings and squarefree $\mathbb{N}^n$-graded modules,* J. Algebra **225** (2000), 630–645 (DOI: 10.1006/jabr.1999.8130)
[18] T. Zaslavsky, *Facing up to arrangements: face-count formulas for partitions of space by hyperplanes*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **1**, Amer. Math. Soc. Providence, RI, 1975 (DOI: 10.1090/memo/0154)

Faculty of Eduation, University of Teacher Education Fukuoka, Munakata, Fukuoka 811-4192, Japan
E-mail address: rokazaki@fukuoka-edu.ac.jp

Department of Mathematics, Kansai University, Suita, Osaka 564-8680, Japan
E-mail address: yanagawa@ipcku.kansai-u.ac.jp